The Religion of Main Street

Rev. Dr. Percy Stickney Grant

III - 13 - 2

APR 20 1961

LIBRARY OF
EVANGELICAL SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY

No.

Donor Rev. A. J. Brunner

THE RELIGION OF MAIN STREET

AUTHOR OF

AD MATREM
THE SEARCH OF BELISARIUS
OBSERVATIONS IN ASIA
SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY
FAIR PLAY FOR THE WORKER
A FIFTH AVENUE PARADE

THE RELIGION OF MAIN STREET

BY

REV. DR. PERCY STICKNEY GRANT

LIBRARY OF
Un[illegible]ical Seminary
10066
BX
5132
.G419
1923
51,481

NEW YORK
AMERICAN LIBRARY SERVICE
1923

The Evangelical
School of Theology

Copyright, 1923
American Library Service

All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS

PAGE

SHALL WE CONSECRATE CHURCHES? 7

"BEHOLD, I HAVE GIVEN HIM FOR A WITNESS TO THE PEOPLE, A LEADER AND COMMANDER TO THE PEOPLE" 25

THE BISHOP'S LETTER 47

DR. GRANT'S REPLY 55

BISHOP MANNING'S SECOND LETTER 77

BENEATH THE SURFACES 85

OLD AND YOUNG 103

SHOULD LIBERALISM BE GENERALLY TAUGHT? . . . 127

THE RELIGION OF MAIN STREET 151

A FIRMER FOUNDATION FOR CHRISTIANITY 169

DO WE NEED A NEW RELIGION? 181

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

APR 2 0 1961

SHOULD THE CHURCHES BE CONSECRATED?

SHALL WE CONSECRATE CHURCHES?

Our text is from the thirty-second chapter of Exodus, the 29th verse:

"Consecrate yourselves to-day unto the Lord."

Our subject is, *Shall We Consecrate Churches?*

My reply to that question is "No."

Number one: because the idea is inherited from the times of witchcraft, magic and taboo,—what we are after to-day is mental emancipation in the interests of saving mental power. If our minds are fussing with such directions as the thought which is called upon for the consecration of the church we lose just so much time and interest and power for the realities of to-day.

Number two: a consecration of churches limits their use in the community, and that again means the economic waste. We all know that we waste enough. I have told you of those rather amateurish figures of mine which shows that the United States wastes twenty-five billions a year, and a gentleman who is before me told me that a statistician in Massachusetts puts it on the conservative basis of one hundred and twenty-five billions of waste in this country every year. So if you limit the use of churches you are simply adding to that enormous and almost incalculable waste.

This sermon is not an attack on anybody or anything. Of course our journalistic friends are always

looking out for attacks; there is nothing in the way of news unless some man's head is punched, or there is some personal arrow drawn, or personal conquest takes place. Nothing of that kind is in my mind. Our time together is to be taken up with a straightforward talk in the interests of economy and social welfare.

Here are 234,000 churches, synagogues, etc., in the United States. I quote from memory taken from the literature sent around by the World Wide Movement of a few years ago that was finally ended without being truly launched. Now these 234,000 churches represent $3,000,000,000 in tax exempt property—a large sum of money. When this country tries to raise that amount it has to put in a great deal of work. Both figures are large; the number of churches is large and the amount of property they represent is large. I was perfectly overwhelmed by it; and what it costs the Government in loss of revenue is a large sum of money.

In return for such a donation as the remission of taxes on the three billion dollars worth of property, the 234,000 churches are expected to be of as much use as possible to the community. In some communities the church is the only public building or meeting place. In many places there is no town hall, no movie theatre, no fireman's hall—these firemen's halls are useful amusement centers for little villages. There are lots of towns where there is no such place, nothing except the little church. Even in larger towns and cities the churches represent some of the best auditoriums, the most spacious, the most comfortable.

Whatever limits the use of these churches reduces what the country gets by remitting the taxes on three billion dollars worth of property.

For instance (I am fond of figures, that is one of the things you have to bear with), suppose each of these 234,000 churches by their restrictions loses twenty-five people every Sunday. That means nearly six million people every Sunday shut out of the churches. Suppose they lost fifty people on an average every Sunday they might otherwise have held, that means a loss of nearly twelve million people who are kept out of the churches every Sunday.

Don't you suppose that if some bright man or woman were permitted to have the church for an hour or two when no one else was using it, and this speaker were to make a useful address on a problem of political life, which means life under Government, or economic conditions, which means bread and butter, wages; or on social questions, which means housing, hygiene, education, etc.—don't you suppose that each of these 234,000 churches could secure an average of fifty more people than at present enter the doors on Sunday? If that supposition is right then these twelve millions who are not in the churches might otherwise be there. And according to this supposed picture of an expert talking on some of these subjects, the political, the economic, or the social, according to that picture there would be an enormous education, an enormous incentive by means of education, not only to a wider Americanism but a wider individual life. This especially would be the case if the audience were permitted

not only to listen but to ask questions, and not only to ask questions but to make short speeches themselves on the subjects presented. Don't you believe you would get fifty more people in each of these 234,000 churches on an average, with such a program as that?

Anybody who has tried it knows the answer to that. We in this church had between 800 and 1000 for two years every Sunday to hear valuable talks on social and economic problems: then there was practice in thinking, in speaking, to say nothing about the expression of personal need, the sincere expression of needs and hopes, which are our prayers. Think of your own little prayers, following the prayers in the Prayer Book, perhaps the deep needs of your own, the personal needs, the needs of your family. But in contrast to that think of the hot prayer and petition of the man who feels that life has not been altogether just to him, and does not understand the ins and outs of these social ways that bear too hard on him. Don't you think his prayer is a pretty hot thing to the throne of God, sincerely expressing the needs of his life? I do, and that God on his throne will listen to such prayers as that more easily than to a luke-warm form by you and me of words that are our only prayer.

In spite of the needs of these people possible to be met by these 234,000 churches, many or most of them are treated to a coating of words called consecration, that if narrowly interpreted, prevents them being used in such a beneficent way. The Church of the Ascension, that has been in this same place for nearly a hundred years of its existence, had a formula read

over it to the effect that nothing common or unhallowed could take place in it. A little speech by a working man is considered by the authorities common and unhallowed, so he cannot be allowed to speak. You remember what St. Peter in the dream said about the food that was lowered down to him; he said, "No, I cannot eat that, for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." Then in the vision, God said to him, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." If that can be said about pigs, I wonder if it cannot be said about human beings. Yet this workingman's speech on the street corner or as an election spell-binder may be an important influence in the electing of our rulers; in choosing laws for the Government of over 100,000,000 people. The working man silenced in a church may from a soap-box name the officers of the Government who direct legislation, who sign treaties, and make peace or war. When these persons whose speech is supposed to be common and unhallowed inside of the church, are numerous enough multiplied, they will control the Government.

Now consecration, after all, coming right down to a common sense idea, is the perception of a special service by and through a thing, something it can render better than anything else can, or than some other person or thing can do. Consecration then is the perception of special services by and through a thing and the care that its environment should be kept helpful to such ends.

If you are determined that a special thing shall give

to a community all those things you think it needs, you will not only prevent other things from happening that would seriously disturb that, but you will try to have a condition in and around it that will develop an environment to satisfy that need. You consecrate your home when you make it a place of beautiful care and co-operation between members of the family, a place where the gifts and powers of each one find co-operative outlet. You consecrate a church when by actual utility you make it a place of profound value to the inspirational side of human life, when the people inside of it are men with a clear knowledge of human life; when there is beauty, kindness, helpfulness, which produce a tonic atmosphere; when sweet smiles and serious meditation and prayer hold countenances in great nobility; when business prejudices are forgotten and industrial groups are transformed into citizens of the kingdom of God, that is, the ideal of more perfect human co-operation. Who to-day will say that is not the most essential requirement of our time?

The form of consecration of a church or chapel is given in the Book of Common Prayer. The essential part of that service is as follows: "This sets apart the church from unhallowed and worldly things." The common sense of humanity approves of such a separation of churches from, let us say, the banking business, or the butcher business, or the pawnbrokers shop, or a dance hall.

But the idea of the consecration of churches has come down from the ancient ideas associated with taboo, that is, things among the lower savage races

that the priests said could not be done, and which were associated in the minds of the worshippers with the magic and miraculous powers supposed to reside in the priesthood. This idea of a magic power has been perpetuated in the consecration of the churches, so that consecration, strictly interpreted, has meant that something has happened to the church that cannot be explained under ordinary formulas of intelligence or action; that God dwells in the church as nowhere else, except in similar churches, and that anything outside of acts of worship, or similar acts, which may take place in the church, are blasphemous and a blow to the indwelling deity.

The power of the priests to perform such an act with such consequences is due to a theory which is still held by the Roman Catholic Church, and by the High Churchmen in the Episcopal Church—what is called the Apostolic Succession, that is a line of bishops unbroken from Christ to Bishop Manning, all endowed with miraculous powers. Through this Apostolic Succession the clergy and priesthood of the present day have received miraculous powers from Jesus Christ who received them from God. That is the situation.

I am talking to an intelligent audience and I don't expect them to be shocked if I say that very few clergymen educated in the larger universities accept the idea that Jesus Christ has the power of God. When I say "larger universities" I mean places where science as well as classics and mathematics are taught.

Whatever we mean by God, at any rate we mean

the power responsible for this universe, for us, and the past, the present and the future. Now to say that Jesus Christ corresponds to that, is something I fancy very few persons would be willing to say. He doubtless did miracles, as they were regarded in His day. But as M. Coué points out, many of them were acts of auto-suggestion, and could fall under well known categories clearly and well classified by psychologists to-day. Science understands them; they are not miracles, they are scientific facts.

The educated classes to-day, including clergymen and priests, do not accept the position of a miraculous consecration because they do not believe in the miraculous powers of the priesthood. They do not see the propriety of taboo upon a church building that seriously interferes with its high purpose. Let us say this purpose is the worship of God and the service of mankind; or, as Professor Carver, of Harvard, has put it, "The problem of the human race is to help the living." Do you think the problem of the human race is something else? The Church, in my opinion, is the place where this help truly is realized to an overwhelming degree. That is what we are doing in prayer; that is what we are doing in praise; in the sense of fraternity as we all sit here to-day, and in the exaltation of spirit. Here we increase the feeble power within us to nobler, larger thought and action, even to real self-sacrifice, the essence of the Christian Church. Isn't it wise to keep our helpfulness to the living free from the taboo side of life, so antagonistic to its high possibilities?

The priestly idea of the miraculous has penetrated other institutions besides that of the church as an edifice. It has laid its hands on certain sides of life and called them sacraments. Again the relation of the church to those things is regarded as miraculous, wonder-working. Take the matter of marriage, baptism, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, extreme unction, etc. Anybody can see advantages in high relationships from giving them the general atmosphere of nobility, of expectation, of high vision; but, only if we clearly understand that priests have no power to make marriage more than it is. Its sacredness, we perceive, comes not from the priest, but from the very heart of this extraordinary relationship, from the essential characteristics, which have to do with the attitudes and lives of the people involved, and the lives of the future, and cannot be regarded as something independent of their feeling, will and behavior, by the assertion of the church or any other external organization.

The poet James Russell Lowell said: "The miracle fades out of history." The miracle fades out of consecration. Our task therefore consists in finding a golden light in the heart of human life, without the aid of the miraculous so that when the miracle fades we have something more enduring, something more wonderful than the miracle which will not fade, the beauty and growth in the soul. Consecration puts gold leaf over a live thing and kills it. There was a little child in Rome wanted in a pageant, to take the part of an angel. They covered his body with gold leaf, and he was a little golden angel in the pageant,

but the stopping up of all the pores in his body was so against nature that he died.

You have heard the story of the veteran of the French army, one of Napoleon's veterans, when he was under the hands of a surgeon probing for a bullet. The old veteran said: "Surgeon, go no further, or you will touch my heart and hurt what is locked there, the image of the Emperor."

We must learn to-day that the great things in life are not plastered from the outside, even when the plaster is gold leaf, but are found in the heart, and that there are even greater things there than the image of the Emperor.

I repeat when the miracle fades out of history we want something more enduring, something more wonderful, that will never fade, and we find the beauty and growing loveliness of the soul.

Here is a newspaper clipping which says that Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts heads a movement to raise the standard of the ministry, and wants high class men. The Cambridge Episcopal Theological School, of which he is the head, only admits now college graduates. So far as mental equipment and the ordinary standards of scholarship go, Bishop Lawrence's school has a fine lot of men. He says that the church has not met the needs of a vigorous, forcible ministry; that there ought to be a lifting of the standard all along the line. The great danger is that those in authority may call on men of second and third class ability.

But why not call on men of second and third class ability if religion is sacramentarianism? If the ministry is to be a mechanical service of the sacraments by people who believe in their miraculous origin and power, then any plowboy can take the job. In fact, that is the source from which to recruit the ministry, for their ignorance and credulity would easily persuade them of the miraculous character of the ministry. He can have consecration or ordination, he can wear the gorgeous sacramental garments suited to the High Churchman for the purposes of the sacrament, and he can say the words of the Prayer Book for those services, yet he need not have an idea in his head or spend five minutes in serious thought, or know an answer to a social or economic question. The unintellectual quality of his office would require nothing more than he would bring from the fields. Is this the kind of ministry that Bishop Lawrence wishes to improve?

The trouble with the ministry is not the scholarship or ability of the college boy that goes from college to the theological school. The trouble is the repression of the best thought and study of the clergymen by their comfort-loving congregations, who do not want to be stirred up by the problems of the day. The trouble with the clergy is the repression by officials in ecclesiastical authority who call a halt on freedom of thought in the pulpit.

I see a great many ministers and I am very proud of those men in terms of intelligence and ability. I belong to a club that contains fifty Episcopal clergy-

men of this city and the neighborhood. There is never a paper read, or a discussion held, that does not surprise me by their ability. I sometimes laugh at those fellows and say to them,—Your preaching is the worst thing you do. Everything else you do better than what you do in the pulpit. Why is that so, if it is so? I claim it is because they are not free in the pulpit.

A man at lunch with me a day or two ago, a man of education, a journalist of experience who has traveled all over the country and knows most of the important men of the country, said, "The trouble with the church is this: in the towns and cities the clergy don't measure up to the able lawyers or other intelligensia of these places. In Washington the Senators ask—Why should we go to church to those fellows who haven't anything to tell us? "Those fellows" have a great deal they might tell them, only the general feeling is if they wanted to preach a bona fide sermon they would have to do it on the street corner. My belief is that a clergyman in the pulpit, or in the study, should have as much freedom of thought as Voltaire when he sat down to his desk to write—absolutely no cabal, no change, no thoughts, no influences, that prevent what brain he has, what knowledge he has, what experience he has, from finding the fullest, and aptest, and strongest expressions in the sermon, and that unless such things take place congregations are deprived of the value of that mind's service.

Now, think, there are 200,000 clergymen in this country, and somebody is always saying to them Whoa! Hold on! Not so fast! Keep quiet! In my

experience clergymen are educated and well informed. They have a wide social experience and are great readers.

So the equipment of the college is all right; the mental attitude is all right; the studies are all right; then they put the extinguishers on most of them. That is my reply to Bishop Lawrence. If he wants a higher standard it is not to be secured by telling a man that first you have got to know more Greek or more Latin, or this or that or the other—not at all. There is a great deal of waste time in the theological colleges. What Bishop Lawrence might do is to use his influence in the House of Bishops to liberalize and lift the whole conception of the preacher's position so that we can say what we think, and be encouraged to think, think, think; to study, study, study; to perceive the needs of life and co-ordinate them with all the comforts they are capable of to the great end of helping our time progress.

This is such a subject that I am going much beyond the time. I am just illustrating a little bit this word consecration. You hear a great deal of talk of self-consecration. Our text says "Consecrate yourselves to-day unto the Lord." That is a pretty good text. This self-consecration is not a monastic, dried-up and narrow relationship toward truth. It is a determination to be up-to-date in an up-to-date fashion, showing in the years of one's life all the possibilities of strength and intelligence that his relationships permit.

The fact that somebody has placed his hands on an individual's head does not put something there that

did not exist before, even if those hands be the hands of a Bishop. But a man's own heart can be so inflamed with good will toward his age, with the benefitting of mankind, with the sacrificing of himself in terms of money, comfort and time, that nothing in the world so interests him as humanity's welfare, humanity's happiness. In my opinion that is self-consecration, as far as a clergyman goes, and I think it is a pretty good thing for anyone else.

Consecration is not something that is laid upon the person or a church. Quantities of churches have been consecrated by religious services and pulled down to make room for business blocks, or turned into theatres or other forms of commercial amusements. That is to say, the formal idea of consecration cannot operate as a thing by itself in spite of conditions. If therefore consecration is really to benefit the spirit of man, how inane to claim the consecration of an edifice prevents it from meeting the needs of human service. How narrow and intolerant are such ideas in relation to religious church properties. What is more desirable than that people of all races and all classes meet happily in one edifice to listen to the important problems of the life they are having to lead. What is a more real form of democracy in existence than allowing these people to have their say pro and con on important subjects. Whatever other uses you may perceive for a church, can you suggest anything better.

We have court houses and state halls, and libraries, and can provide other places of utility without acts of

consecration, let us understand that a church of God can do the same.

How then are we to consecrate a church? By using it for the service of man; by making it so attractive that it holds persons of great difference of race, class, education and belief, but confers upon all of them joy and courage and faith, inspiration, and help such as we are hoping ourselves this morning to secure.

If we fear contact with the minds of the working people, how then are we going to overcome fear. If the church itself perpetuates this great fear of the reality basis of democracy, that gives it voice.

Justice Holmes, of the Supreme Court, said that he has faith in a universe not measured by our fears, a universe that has thought and more than thought in it. Let not our church life, which is in some way a measure of our faith, be measured by our fears. Let it not be limited by our fears, but getting rid of our fears and all of the narrow, contracted results of our fears, let us penetrate into this universe which, as Justice Holmes says, is thought and more than thought.

What a crime it is to check thought in the pulpit, when any aspiring person is trying to state the facts of life, and the studies of life and co-ordinate them into such a conception as will lead him and mankind to a higher plane.

Whatever then to-day we say about church consecration let us say something about ourselves. We can give a new consecration to the years that are to come, to the desires of life, to the duties of life, to the relationships of life, to the studies, ambitions and hopes

and visions and even prayers of our life and make them perform all the possibilities that lie like seeds in each one of these experiences, when we by this new consecration to God are actually lifted into higher spiritual thoughts and personality and being. We can start it even in the service of this Church this morning.

"BEHOLD, I HAVE GIVEN HIM FOR A WITNESS TO THE PEOPLE, A LEADER AND COMMANDER TO THE PEOPLE"

"BEHOLD, I HAVE GIVEN HIM FOR A WITNESS TO THE PEOPLE, A LEADER AND COMMANDER TO THE PEOPLE"

Our text is from the fifty-fifth chapter of the Book of Isaias, the 4th verse:

"Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people."

Professor Leighton of the Ohio University, the head of the Department of Philosophy, and also a clergyman of our church, says that "Ideas are cheques drawn on the bank of experience. If they are returned marked 'no funds' they are false."

William James, the psychologist, says: "True ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify." Let us keep those four words in our minds, they are worth while—"True ideas are those we can assimilate," those we can get assistance from, get life from; "that we can validate," prove the truth of; "corroborate" by contact with facts in some way that satisfies yourself; and "verify." Those last three words represent different conditions, but they sound something like the same thing. In other words, if you cannot assimilate a thought and cannot validate and corroborate and verify it, then it is false.

History is a record of living ideas that supplant dead ones, a record of progressiveness. What a lot of ideas you used to have that you have now given up. No matter how handsome a dead idea is, even if

as handsome as a Pharoah in a tomb, we would rather have a living, modest living idea—one that can be made a part of us to-day, than a gold enameled idea that is dead.

Dr. Briggs, who was tried for heresy and put out of the Presbyterian Church, told me one day at luncheon, fifteen years later, that at the time of our conversation his judges had changed their ideas, and held those so-called heresies for which they had put him out of the church. They could no longer stomach the ideas that had made them persecutors. They could not assimilate them; or corroborate them, or validate them, or verify them.

If ideas are as important as Professor Leighton and William James seem to think, it is clear that nothing must stand in the way of our having them presented to us—ideas in politics, economics, sociology and religion. We must demand the widest presentation of ideas be made to us so that we can select and experiment with them and see whether they are good food or not; whether they may be assimilated, validated, corroborated and verified. Accordingly we must have the fullest freedom of speech in order to hear the greatest number of ideas; for of course we cannot test or assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify ideas until we know them. That is your method of growing and my method of growing—a sort of Forum method.

You don't value yourself physically highly when you grow old. Athletes after the thirties are rather passé. As you grow older you pride yourself on having juster

ideas about things, ideas that conform more to the facts of life. A man must get rid of a lot of fantasies and dreams and falsehoods and replace them by facts, things he can put his finger on. A man wants to feel the ground under his feet, as he grows older. He gets rid of ideas that he can not assimilate or verify and substitutes ideas that he can assimilate and verify.

That then is our manner of mental growth—getting rid of false ideas and acquiring true ideas. Anyone who stops that process is hindering civilization, I might say is blackjacking the soul.

What do you require of a religion? What do you want it to do for you? Something like this perhaps is the answer: You wish your religion to give you courage, comfort, inspiration for effort. I never had a more pleasant confirmation of that than from a young man in this church, who told me that he went out from church so filled with energy he wanted to fight the lamppost, and he did not mean fighting the lamppost in the way we may have seen some inebriates doing. So you wish your religion to give you courage and you want it to give you comfort, Heaven knows we constantly see the sad side of life. Those who are dear to us are stricken down at our side. Here is a telegram,—a boy I was brought up with, a college chum, after a few days of sickness had died. We also ask our religion to give us hope when confronted by the brutal facts of death. Our religion must give comfort and hope. While we do not believe with Emerson that we are as lazy as we dare to be, yet we do not

want to be as lazy as we are. We want something that will inspire us, and make it worth our while to be up and doing.

We need encouragement to have good will toward our fellow men. Lots of things occur that are not very pleasant, and turn our minds to unsatisfactory sides of life. A certain man in the Bible said, "All men are liars." Well, we want to have a religion that will keep us out of that as a permanent state of mind.

In short, your religion fills the world with a power that is on your side. You are not alone in this world with this religion. You are not weak with your religion. You have the central powers of God on your side and with you.

Now to secure such great helps to living, under the circumstances of man's various phases of development through his million or so years of evolution, he has fashioned for himself certain beliefs and practices, which he has a perfect right to do. He has worshipped fetishes, wonder-working relics, and there is plenty of evidence that the results were favorable to the needs of man. He has worshipped spirits, mostly evil spirits, and has created formulas and tricks to thwart these evil spirits. He has put faith in magic as practiced by rain-making priests, and sought to add to his powers some of the powers of nature. He has personified these powers of nature and worshipped them—Zeus, the god of the bright sky; Jove, the thunder, and the stars, and the productive forces of earth and of humanity.

Magic the students of to-day say was the earliest

form of science, the trying to get out of nature the powers which man beheld but did not understand and by magic formulas to procure the power for himself.

From all this he has secured encouragement and comfort and inspiration, and fellowship and the sense of God's presence. It stands to reason that the religion that gives these desirable things in the largest degree, with the smallest overhead charge in terms of things that are not true, is the best religion. We don't want a religion that has too large an overhead charge. If out of 365 days in the year a man's religion demands that he give two hundred to religious ceremonials, etc., absence from work, etc., that would be too expensive an overhead charge for religion. If out of his limited mental life (thought of in terms of conquest over nature) man had to lumber his mind with quite opposite fantasies, beliefs and customs—which in fact hold him back in his mental task of understanding and conquering nature, then that would be a very expensive overhead. You want religion to give you all it can and not waste your time or reduce the intellectual productiveness of your days. In fact, you want religion to enhance your powers.

Now the Christian religion undertook to do some of these things in the most attractive way—by teaching mankind how wonderfully made they were; that they were all brethren and the temples of God, holy, sacred, divine creatures, and that at the heart of the universe was something that cares—that was in fact love. Jesus showed the happiness of discovering spiritual beauties in everyone and in helping everyone. So

everyone you meet becomes an instrument of revelation. You cannot meet anyone, that you try at all to know, without finding some gold in them, and precious stones, and loveliness; something to trust; to build upon.

So Jesus, this teacher of God, who called God "love," even on the Cross asked his heavenly Father to forgive his enemies, because they were ignorant. You don't think of Jesus as being bored; you don't think of him as having any of the unpleasant temperamental conditions which make some of us grouchy or unpleasant companions.

Now the Christian religion, viewed from that point of view, needs only the testimony of the soul. It does not need transactions in the miraculous, contrary to what we understand to be the laws of nature. The miracle of Christianity is the revealed wonder-working laws of the human life, the transforming power of love, and of the deep perceptions of life which Jesus taught. Accordingly many clergymen refuse to permit the splendor of Christianity to be made dark and difficult by stories which do not agree with our scientific knowledge. The famous Dean Inge of St. Paul's, London, recently said something like this: "The authorities of the Church in England must understand how many clergymen there are who can get along without the miraculous."

Religion ought to be the easiest thing in the world. We heard in the 55th chapter of Isaiah this morning, that everything broke forth into singing. That is what religion ought to do. Religion ought to be an

easy thing instead of a difficult thing. That is what Jesus was trying to make it. Didn't he tell the religious leaders of his time that they placed burdens on the people too heavy to be borne. That was the challenge of his ministry. The burden of expensive sacrifice were to be taken away. The burden of difficult knowledge and of obedience to many regulations. All he asked the people to do was to act toward each other as brethren—to treat each other right.

If religion is an instinct for personal and world improvement, it should be something that mankind goes about with singing, with a free mind and heart, and no burden on his shoulders. When all manner of things that affront reason, that perplex decision, and seem to have nothing to do with the betterment of mankind are made the very gateway of religion, then something is certainly wrong. When fellowship with a religious reformer and leader who claimed that he was "the way, the truth and the light," and whose words and deeds bore out the statement, when such association can only be secured in official church organization by belief in facts and theories, which no college faculty in this country could honestly O.K., then religion is made a distressing controversy, a confused mental combat, a clinging to outworn forms, which takes the heart out of what should be a perpetual inspiration.

The history of the Nineteenth Century records individuals spiritually shipwrecked because they supposed that religion depended upon the miraculous, those things which a man could not adjust himself to or accept. In the middle of that century Amiel said that

what we wanted was a new psychology. Charcot, Freud, Jung, William James, have given us this psychology. We understand in a large measure how human consciousness came into being. The religious question to-day is not concerned with physical evolution, that was settled sixty years ago. Religion is concerned with the evolution of the soul. William James said we could not get away from religion, because our nature was made in such a way with its two sides the subliminal and the conscious pushed each other on. By the way we are constructed, religion is born in us. The new psychology offers a basis of religion that nobody can take away from you.

The attacks upon liberalism are covert attacks upon the evolution of consciousness which is the commanding scientific fact, so far as religious people are concerned; for it gives them the laws of their own beings, its weaknesses, its strength, its degeneration, its development. Their co-operation with these laws and love of this possibility of development, is the test of religion.

A great many of the attacks on liberalism to-day are a continuation of these old attacks upon such men as Darwin. I had to write an article upon Darwin years and years ago and I was astonished to find how soon after his book came out the ecclesiastical people got after him. The Bishop of Oxford attacked Darwin and his idea of physical evolution. Then they attacked Romanes and his idea of mental evolution. Now clergymen are attacked who read psychology and believe in the evolution of consciousness.

Some people got accustomed to the physical side of

evolution but could not stand for the mental evolution. They said that reduces mind to dirt and mud. What nonsense! Then come along psychologists and say the soul itself is an evolutionary product. This science of psychology is of enormous value for it tells us the laws of the soul.

A man can say to himself to-day—What does the God of this universe want of me? By the light of psychology he can reply. So far as I can see the God of the Universe wants me to be a perfected personality; He wants me to be obedient to the laws of inner growth, and not to behave in such a way as to destroy the loveliness and beauty of the human spirit, inside of the human body. Then too God wants me to turn around and improve human environment. Those are the needs of to-day. We are like a driver who holds the reins of four or eight horses in one hand. We must keep our consciousness unified. Then we must make our environment meet the needs of our natures. When we hear that the working people don't like to live in houses where there is no plumbing, or in towns where there is no hall or meeting place, we will say it is perfectly right they should kick at that; they want their environment to assist in the development of their personality.

I was a clergyman for seven years in a town where the only recreation of the population was riding to the cemetery. That was so much recognized by the undertakers that they did not go straight to the cemetery by the shortest route, but they would drive down to the city hall and around it and then into what we might

call the Fifth Avenue of the place, past all the fine houses and finally arrive at the cemetery. These hackmen knew that they were paid a dollar for that ride and they must take the avenues in order to please the people. Well, to-day we don't want bad environments. We wish undertakers well, but we are not contented with an environment that gives them too much to do.

To-day we have more reason for loving the God of life than ever the past had for loving the God of death. We know to-day that on man's side there are powers of nature of incredible richness and potency. In the past death seemed to have been more in the mind of man than life. They were afraid of life and tried to make terms all the time with death. There is wrapped up in every human being undeveloped powers of startling magnitude. Try to remember that. We don't have to grope through life on some milk train of energy. What we want to do is to get on an express train and go fast and far. That is one of the things these gentlemen called psychologists found out for us, that there is incredible power in us which it is worth using for ourselves and for mankind.

I don't ask you to fight lampposts, I ask you to fight the indifference or laziness or ignorance that prevents you from taking hold of yourself and from making yourself more than you are. We see to-day that the needs of all mankind are the same—we need health, and the normal development of personality, with the protection of environment suited to sustain, aid and develop these things.

As to the future life, religion cannot help having an opinion about it. No one can have a profounder hope or belief than the man who thinks the highest of life here. The more we think of life here the more we believe in the life hereafter. I have constantly used this illustration: Suppose a Chinaman whose father had been a manufacturer of porcelain, and whose grandfather had been a manufacturer of porcelain, suppose this Chinaman, in whose family for centuries this great art had been practiced, tries to carry out some of the ideas and ideals of his ancestors, particularly as to color in his porcelain. Finally he accomplishes the experiment. You saw in the Morgan collection the Black Hawthorne valued at $45,000 and the Peach Bow valued at $15,000, and what would you say if this man who finally got this miraculous color he had struggled for so long and his ancestors had worked for—in the moment of his triumph should take that beautiful vase and smash it on the ground?

After all this world that seems such a mad world, is not such a mad world after all. We know the sun is going to rise and is going to set, the marvelous universe is whirling around without very much motion, and this certain temperature which we are able to live in is going to last for a long time. Do you suppose that the power we call God and that has given a million years to the production of you and me is going to throw us on the scrap heap with nothing more doing? It is not according to reason, or according to common sense. So I say the whole course of life leads us to believe that there is something beyond.

I am interested, as I have said, to have a religion that will not waste so much time as mine has done. A great deal of my mature life has been spent in getting rid of what I was taught in my youth. Other people have said to me that it is the same with them. I have always hoped that things said in the Church of the Ascension could really be built into life in a substantial way and not afterward thrown out, but become a permanent foundation for anyone to build upon. It seems to me that religious instruction ought to be like that. Now the religion of perfected consciousness can be like that, because if you learn how you are organized, the laws of the inner nature that are to be obeyed, while there may be some shifting and changing of emphasis or clarification by future explanation, then on the whole you have something that will not be thrown out and will not make you discouraged.

Religious belief in the past was too often like pebbles in the shoes, very unpleasant and you had to advance slowly. The only thing to do is to take the shoe off and get out the pebble.

People are all the time saying, "Why are not the liberals constructive? They pull down but they do not build up. They tell you what they don't like, but they do not tell you what they do like, and when they try to be constructive they are singularly incompetent, weak and unsatisfactory." It is easier for a man to tear down a building than to put up the building.

Often the despairing cry of the liberal is the cry of pain. After all, as someone has said, pain is the

cry of the nerve for pure blood. If the liberal cries in pain it is a cry for fresh and pure truth.

Across the street, perhaps you have noticed they are pulling down several houses. The one in the corner was the first mansard roofed house built in New York, a house of large rooms, great comfort, which has dispensed splendid hospitalities. The houses next to it too were desirable dwellings. The house across the street from the Rectory, which will also come down, was a delightful home. These four fine dwellings, with stables and sheds, are being levelled to the ground, because the owners wish to build a fifteen-story apartment house which will probably hold one hundred times more people than the land has ever before taken care of, for a permanent residence.

Very few people will complain because such an important location as the corner of Fifth Avenue and Tenth Street is made a pleasant home for a larger number of families, who have to live and work in New York. But leaving that our of consideration, evidently these houses have to be torn down before anything can be built up There always has to be some clearing of the ground if new things, new institutions, new ideas, new customs are to be given room.

A liberal is not a man who delights in destruction; that is nonsense. He sees more vividly that the thing that is torn down is to be replaced by something that is going to do a lot of good. We have to remember that we live under institutions that seem to have certain hard and fast lines of law, but are really plastic, because all the time they are under the interpretation

of the mind. We adopted the Constitution of the United States, but shortly it had to be interpreted. One interpretation is a local one and another a federal interpretation. There are things in the Constitution that sound to you and me fixed, yet the courts have interpreted them as demanded by the needs of the country saying such needs are superior to the little text of the Constitution. We have to live in some sort of a framework, some organization, but within that there exists the movement of the mental life, a constant change is going on, which eventuates in outer changes as well, but meanwhile the spirit of the inner is on the whole dominating the materialism of the outer.

La Folette, Borah, Johnson are members of the same party as Henry Cabot Lodge. Their interpretation is different from his, but who can say that the Republican party, or any other party is not encouraged by those who go far along the interpretative side, the living side, the side that tries to meet the requirements of the facts of life to-day rather than the letter of their organization.

An alienist told me that in his hospital, in a room shrouded in mysterious darkness, penetrated occasionally by flashes of electricity, he could so force emotion of individuals there that they would say and do almost anything. A great deal of the older religion was of this kind—fear forced emotions to a lamentable and distressed mental and physical extent. And some of the nervous disease of America are the result to-day of that kind of religion. Men and women, coming out of Puritan meeting houses, had hysterics, and shook

like leaves with uncontrollable nervous tremors, so that in the churchyard they had stakes planted for them to hold on to until the hysterical tremors passed. That is a religion that probably you and I are glad we don't have. Nor do we wish to return to it. To-day all that is considered little short of criminal. Far from being thought religious it is an insult to Deity and an outrage upon human nature.

The same distinguished physician, who is so important a member of the church as to be on its great committees, said to me, without my having said anything to him of my thought, that the great object of man's life to-day was development of personality and the improvement of environment. I never was so surprised in my life, as when the doctor whispered this formula in my ears at his own table.

I have always preferred to picture Christ from his associates. I would rather hear about Napoleon from his generals than from Lord Roseberry. I would rather learn about Christ from Matthew, than from St. Augustine. The friends of Jesus deal in facts, the later theologians in metaphysical theories.

I said last Sunday, that when Christ was on earth he did not possess the power of God. This is certainly the teaching of the first three Gospels—Matthew, Mark and Luke. Those are what the theologians call the synoptic gospels.

Bishop Gore, the most eminent voice in the Church of England, says that the Virgin Birth was not a part of the teaching of the early church.

Jesus said: "Why callest thou me good? There is

none good but one—that is God." And he said: "My Father is greater than I." Is this not what St. Paul also affirmed when he said: "Christ emptied himself." As the great author of the Colossians put it: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." So Jesus is called a revelation of God. Jesus was perfectly human. Whatever else we choose metaphysically to say about him must be brought into accord with his humanity.

My view of Jesus is rather that of the companions of Jesus than of the later theologians. By and by, under the influence of Plato, and later in Rome, of Aristotle, the idea of Jesus turned into the picture of a stern judge, whose decrees were so severe that men and women prayed to his mother to ask her son to relent.

Instead of the loving shepherd, they had the stern judge, and mankind did not know what to do with this judge of severe castigation. So they humbly went to the mother of Jesus to ask her to plead with her Son. Then came in the worship of the Virgin Mary.

The vital laws of the soul should not depend upon outward authority. There is a line of Milton that is something like this: "These laws are laws that can enforce themselves." Such are the laws of the soul. They can enforce themselves. If we disobey the laws of the soul we don't have to wait to get to heaven to be punished for that, but the punishment fits the crime immediately. These laws that are in our consciousness are laws that can enforce themselves. The religion of greatest freedom joined to the religion of

greatest intelligence is going to get along very well indeed without outer authority. We must advance therefore by greater study into greater knowledge, greater success, in solving the problems of this complicated human mind. We don't want to waste so much time on things that are nonsense. Think of the problems of Europe, England and the United States! before which the brains of the world seem paralyzed. Why is it? The soul-consciousness of the world has got to get at those things. There must be better studies in the schools and colleges to assist in the solution and we must get rid of superstitions that take up too much room in our rather small minds.

After all has been said we must remember that Jesus asked not of his followers metaphysical exaltation or devotion, but He asked a very simple thing. He asked them to love Him—to follow Him.

I used that text from the Old Testament Lesson read to-day because it seemed to meet that particular point very nicely. "Behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people." You cannot be a witness and a leader and commander to the people if you hold to conflicting ideas. You remember that Abraham Lincoln said we could not have two governments here, one of Freedom and one of Slavery. Jesus was a commander and leader because He said we all must have good will toward each other. He was single minded.

Listen to some of the things He said:

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;

But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite you on the right cheek turn to him the other also.

And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Ye have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?

And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?

Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

Now that is the spirit of Jesus Christ. That is Christianity. It is not a belief, it is a scientifically necessary emotion and relation.

After all, these matters are your affair. Do you want an American church which believes in freedom rather than in authority? Then have it. Do you want unshackled clergy, so that when they get up in a place like this they preach the truth, and are not held by strings pulling this way and that? If you want an unshackled clergy, have it. Do you want to know all they can find out for you, or do you want them to conceal those facts? One of the perquisites of being a minister is that a minister has a good deal of time and cause for reading. He has to read a great many

books. Do you want your clergyman to pass on all this or to keep it to himself, if these facts do not chime with something taught forty years ago?

Do you want the church to be ruled and silenced by sinister financial powers? You know this church is empty and dark every Sunday night. It used often to be as full as it is to-day on Sunday nights, with a very happy and wonderful lot of people. Do you want more churches shut up? Do you want to keep graduates of universities out of the ministry, and out of the church congregation?

When your son comes back from college, and you say to him: "Come to church this morning," do you want him to reply, "Father, no; don't ask me to listen to such bunk as that." (Great applause.)

I will close by reading a stanza of a hymn we sung just before the sermon. Phillips Brooks used to like to read aloud each hymn before it was sung. I will read a verse to you as the end of my remarks this morning:

> Spirit of truth and love
> Life-giving, holy Dove,
> Speed forth thy flight:
> Move on the water's face
> Bearing the lamp of grace,
> And in life's darket place
> Let there be light.

Yes, let there be light—especially in the churches.

THE BISHOP'S LETTER

THE BISHOP'S LETTER

THE REVEREND PERCY S. GRANT, D.D., *Rector*
Church of the Ascension, New York City.

MY DEAR DR. GRANT:

Since my conversation with you last Wednesday afternoon I have given most earnest thought to the matter which we then discussed. That conversation was, as you know, in some important points not reassuring to me, and I feel called upon to let you and the Church know clearly what my judgment is in this matter.

You will, I hope, believe that what I write is not written under any sense of irritation nor with personal feeling of any sort. If you were my own brother, I should feel obliged to write you what I am now writing. If I understand you aright, you confirm as correct the reports of your sermon preached last Sunday and also other utterances which you are reported to have made since that time.

The impression which you have given to the Church and to the public is that you deny the miraculous elements of the Gospel and that you no longer believe the statement of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed. The Apostles' Creed is the statement of the Christian Faith, which not only every minister, but every member of this Church, is required to accept.

As a minister of this Church you are obliged constantly and publicly to declare your belief in it. At every Baptism at which you officiate you are required to ask the person who is seeking admission to the Church, "Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?"

At your ordination you were asked publicly and solemnly: "Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God, so that you may teach the people committed to your Cure and Charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" To this question you replied, "I will do so, by the help of the Lord." If you cannot now conscientiously accept and teach the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed, it is plain that you cannot consistently continue to hold your commission as a minister and teacher in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

In my judgment, therefore, you are called upon to follow one of two courses. You should at once publicly correct the impression given by your recent sermon and state clearly that you do accept the faith of the Church as set forth in the Creed, or if you do not accept this Faith you should voluntarily resign from the ministry of this Church.

This in no way restricts or conflicts with your personal liberty or your freedom of thought. You are at liberty to teach whatever you believe, but you are not at liberty to deny the faith for which the Protestant

Episcopal Church stands and at the same time to continue as one of her ministers. It is incumbent upon all of us to follow what we believe to be the truth wherever it may lead us, and if it leads you outside the Episcopal Church it is your duty courageously and honestly to follow it there, but so long as you elect to remain a minister of this Church, loyalty to its Creed is a binding obligation upon you. If you do not believe in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour you are restricting your own freedom and injuring yourself by remaining in your present position.

The question here involved is one not only of theology, but of honor and good faith. According to your own statement, it appears that you have not only given up belief in this or that less important doctrine, but that you have lost your belief in the Saviour Himself as He is presented to us in the Four Gospels and in the Apostles' Creed. You will say that this Church allows great liberty of interpretations as to the meaning of the articles of the Creed. This is quite true, and I rejoice in the great liberty of thought which this Church allows and desire to uphold it to the utmost limit that is lawful and right. But interpretation of a fact or a truth is one thing and denial of it is another. Interpretation means reasonable explanation of a fact on the basis of its acceptance as true. To call that interpretation which is in fact denial is a misuse of language. There is great liberty of thought and expression in the Episcopal Church, but this does not give her ministers the right to deny the essential faith for which the Church stands.

In a great charge to the Convention of this diocese, entitled "Law and Loyalty," which I would gladly make my own, Bishop Henry C. Potter said: "This Church has her standards of Faith embodied in the Creeds and Offices and Articles which, taken together with Holy Scripture, are here Rule of Faith. In the interpretation of these there always has been, and there always will be, a certain latitude of interpretation for which every wise man will be devoutly thankful. But that that latitude exists is no more certain than that it has its limits, and that the transgression of these limits, by whatever ingenuity it has been accomplished, has wrought only evil in lowering the moral tone of the Church, and in debilitating the individual conscience is, I think, no less certain. . . . Out of all the conflict and clamor of opinions, above all the vagaries of individual sentiment, or inclination, there rises that thing which we call *loyalty,* whether to God or our country, or our Mother, the Church."

I do not believe in heresy trials if these can possibly be avoided. They ought never to be necessary in the Church where the spirit of love and patience and fellowship should reign. If any man knows that he cannot fulfil the terms upon which he holds his office in the ministry he should voluntarily retire from it. But, to quote again the words of Bishop Potter, "Toleration in a Body which professes to hold and teach revealed Truth must have its limits."

I call upon you to correct unmistakably the impression which you have publicly given of your disbelief in our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, or if it

is not possible for you to do so, then to withdraw from the ministry of this Church.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM T. MANNING.

P. S.—As the situation which your widely published statement has created is one of much concern to the Church, I am giving copies of this letter to the newspapers.

DR. GRANT'S REPLY

[Dr. Grant's reply to Bishop Manning was written by a friendly group. It is not a personally-composed letter; but the statement of his case.]

DR. GRANT'S REPLY

THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D.,
Bishop of New York.

MY DEAR BISHOP MANNING:

I shall endeavor to answer your letter of Jan. 19 as clearly and unambiguously as possible.

First, as to the "miraculous elements of the Gospel." I cannot love God with my mind and at the same time believe that the laws of nature were ever violated; for the simple reason that God Himself has taught me, as He is teaching all our sons and daughters in every modern university of the Western world to-day, that those laws are immutable throughout eternity. It is not in the remotest degree that I question His power. It is simply a matter of evidence. Every science which His spirit is revealing to us to-day combines to affirm that "the unfailing order of immortal nature" has behind it His own will and purpose. If you reply that in the Gospel miracles laws of which we have no knowledge were set in operation, I must answer that in such case the alleged events cease to be miracles. Should your hypothetical contention turn out to be true in fact, with all lovers of truth I would rejoice in such fresh revelation. But of this there is as yet not a scintilla of evidence. In the "miracles" of healing, many of the laws employed by Christ have to-day been

made known to us, but we thereby realize clearly that such works are not contrary to but in accordance with law. To another category belong such stories, for instance, as that of Christ walking for perhaps half a mile upon the surface of the water. All books of the New Testament tell us that He had a true human body and lived a real human life. That human body weighed, let us say, 150 pounds. Am I helped either in my own inner life or in my preaching to others by affirming that such a body, in utter defiance of the law of gravitation, walked upon water as upon a solid floor? Were I to state that this is a literal fact, might I not justly be charged with denying the true humanity of our Lord? And I am very sure that Jesus of Nazareth did nothing in His life for the purpose of creating wonder. Indeed, He definitely refused the request for a sign of this character, affirming such seeking to be the mark of a degraded generation.

My position in the matter is that of the Rev. Dr. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, one of the most brilliant minds of the Anglican Communion, who says (*Outspoken Essays,* first series, page 33): "Miracles must, I am convinced, be relegated to the sphere of pious opinion. It is not likely, perhaps, that the progress of science will increase the difficulty of believing them; but it can never again be possible to make the truths of religion depend upon physical portents having taken place as recorded. The Christian revelation can stand without them, and the rulers of the Church will soon have to realize that in very many minds it does stand without them."

The writers of the Gospels were men steeped in the ideas of the Old Testament, according to the documents of which miracle was almost an every-day occurrence. Yet the historicity of those Hebrew stories, as you know well, is to-day rejected by the majority of even the conservative scholars of the Anglican Communion. But is it possible for those who love Truth above all things to draw a line between the Old and the New Testament? Our earliest Gospel was written by a man who had not been a follower of Christ during His life on earth, and the author was, therefore, dependent for his information upon others. Quite apart from this fact, was it not inevitable that in an age in which evidence, sequence, causation were almost wholly unknown terms, that every remarkable event should be explained as "miracle"? I need only remind you, as illustrative of this fact, of the evangelist's explanation of mental disorder by the hypothesis of devil possession. I do not suppose that you, any more than other educated Christian teachers, imagine that in the physical body of the Gergesene "demoniac" were really dwelling some five thousand devils, who, at the word of Christ, transferred themselves to the bodies of swine. But St. Mark, by his use of the word "legion," the name of the Roman regiment, clearly implies that this was the case. On the other hand, again, of course, with you, I truly believe that our Lord healed this unfortunate man. St. Mark explains the fact by the aid of First Century Science, and I by the help of Twentieth Century Science. Is this disloyalty, either to Christ or the Church?

Another factor of which I would remind you, and which has a profound bearing upon the question of miracles, is the manner in which later evangelists heighten the miraculous element in the stories of the earliest Gospel. It is a commonplace of scholarship that "the unknown Palestinian disciple," to use the phrase of Bishop Gore, who compiled the *Gospel according to St. Matthew,* incorporated into his document most of the *Gospel according to St. Mark.* But I ask you to note that in almost every case of "miracle" he has added further miraculous elements to the former's stories. Would you say that I must also believe these? Even Bishop Gore, who is so insistent upon belief in miracle, affirms of at least one which is recorded in St. Matthew's *Gospel,* that "it is difficult to believe it to be historical." We both know that fifty years ago Bishop Gore would have been tried and deposed for that statement; and that Bishop Colenso was degraded for saying far less than what the former Bishop of Oxford has affirmed in his *Belief in God.* Yet to-day Bishop Colenso's belief is held by every conservative Anglican who reads. But, you will reply, "There must be a limit somewhere; a line must be drawn beyond which it is disloyal to go." Most heartily do I concur in this. The limit is Truth; and he who is disloyal to Truth has no place in the ministry of the Church. But Truth is not something of which one can have different brands. There can be no such things as "Episcopalian Truth," or "Presbyterian Truth," or "Catholic Truth." Truth is what *is.* And as the centuries roll on the Holy Spirit of God is ever

guiding men into fresh vistas of Truth. You would not, I know, attempt to silence this search for Truth by authority. Bishop Gore may be in error in his statements; so may I. That is a relatively small matter. What is of supreme importance, if we would follow the example of Christ, whose position in regard to current beliefs was above all things that of critic, is our *attitude* toward Truth. His quarrel with the orthodoxy of His day was not at all because of the inaccuracy or inadequacy of its beliefs. His flaming indignation, so graphically portrayed in the Gospels, was aroused by an *attitude of mind,* which, closed to new Truth, vehemently affirmed it already possessed all Truth. Must the Church of to-day continue to perpetuate this tragic error? As Canon Streeter admirably expresses it:

"While the world—or rather its best men—have been seeking truth, the Church has been interested in defending tradition, with the result that the intellectual leadership, which, in the Middle Ages, belonged to the Church, has passed to the scientist. And the scientist, once outside the boundaries of his own subject and in the sphere of philosophy and ethics, has not infrequently led men wrong, to their no small hurt. Yet for this hurt, too, the Church is more than half responsible, for it has been the attitude of the Church toward the search for truth that has, quite unnecessarily, made science the traditional enemy and thereby prejudiced its devotees against an impartial consideration of the truth for which religion stands. . . . Apologists often point out that when a conflict has arisen between tradi-

tional views and modern hypotheses, whether of science or criticism or history, it has not infrequently happened that the traditionalist has ultimately been found in point of fact to be nearer to the truth. This may be so, but it is irrelevant. The Church's attitude to truth has been a *moral,* not an intellectual failure. To be mistaken about a matter of fact, or to entertain for a time a false hypothesis, is to be guilty of an error which time and further inquiry will correct. Absolute devotion to truth and making mistakes about the truth are quite compatible. Science often makes mistakes. But not to be interested in discovering truth, to make a virtue of the fact under the name of 'faith'; worst of all, deliberately to suppress one's interest under the name of 'the sacrifice of the reason' or 'the asceticism of the intellect,' is (for those who have the requisite mental capacity and training) openly to renounce obedience to the commandment, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *mind.*' Nothing is nobler than the impulse which moves man to offer up his best and dearest to his God, nothing more pathetic than the delusion that he must first slay the thing he offers—whether it be his first-born in the flames of Moloch or his reason at the altar of Christ."

Now as to my belief in the Apostles' Creed. You say in your letter that while there is rightly allowed liberty of interpretation, "to call that interpretation which is, in fact, denial, is a misuse of language." May I venture to apply this sentence to an article of the Creed which we both recite? "I believe . . . He descended into hell"? "Hell" is, of course, the old

English equivalent of the word *inferos* or *inferna,* "the lower parts," which the Latin Creed employs here. "Lower parts of what?" You are as well aware as I what the words meant to the framers of the Creed. The Church inherited a Rabbinic eschatology, based upon a geocentric conception of the universe, according to which the spirit of a man at death went down at a right angle to the plane of the disk on which men lived, to a cavern in the middle of the earth. It was universally believed by the early Christians that at death Christ went to this locality. It is sufficient to remind you of St. Paul's words to the Ephesians: "He that ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth?" Now I plead guilty, not only to an interpretation of this statement, but to one which involves a denial of the fact therein stated. I am as sure as that I am writing these words that there is no such place at a given depth below the surface of the earth, to which the spirits of men go after death. Christ did not go there, for the place does not exist. Would I be in error if I assumed that you heartily endorsed me in this particular matter? Perhaps, however, you will reply that the Protestant Episcopal Church, by her permission to use as an alternative for "hell" "the place of departed spirits," thereby defines this place to be other than a locality under the earth. If this contention be true in fact, then I must answer that our Church by such interpretation has in reality denied the fact which the Creed affirms to be true. From your point of view, could a single portion of the Church lawfully

do this? And how would this harmonize with your statement that "to call that interpretation, which is in fact denial, is a misuse of language"?

Can I be rightly said to disbelieve the Creed because I have come to see that its language here is wholly symbolic? I venture to think that I cannot. The clause was inserted, perhaps to attest the reality of Christ's death, and to affirm that He had a true human spirit. It would be superfluous to say that I believe this. I differ from the framers of the Creed in this particular only in their eschatology, which was an inheritance from Rabbinic Judaism, and which the Spirit of God has shown us to be erroneous. If I am right in thinking you agree with me in this particular, do we not both, not simply interpret, but in our interpretation deny a fact which the Creed affirms to have occurred? And do we think that we are thereby disloyal to the Creed? Do we not rightly feel that we are endeavoring to affirm the essential idea which the framers of the Creed, with less perfect knowledge, were endeavoring to set forth? And we both will continue to affirm that Christ at His death passed into the world of spirit, and not into a locality below the surface of the earth, and this even though the Creed avers the latter, and though the Bishops a few years ago solemnly stated that "fixity of interpretation is of the essence of the Creeds."

With this quotation I should like to compare the formal verdict of the Bishop of Oxford last year in the case of the Rev. Mr. Major, a clergyman of the Church of England. But before reciting this may I

recall the fact that a doctrinal judgment in the Church of England is applicable to our own Communion, inasmuch as our Book of Common Prayer states that "this church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline or worship"? Mr. Major was "cited" before the Bishop of Oxford on the charge that he denied the resurrection of the body. Replying to the charge at the demand of his bishop, the accused, in a lengthy written statement, expounded historically, first, the meaning of the clause as held by Christians at the time it was inserted into the Creed, and as believed by the Church until the middle of the Nineteenth Century. There was no possible ambiguity about the Church's belief. The original language of the Creed read, not "body" but "flesh," sometimes "this flesh"; and with the exception of some Alexandrian theologians, practically all Christians through the centuries believed that at the final judgment the actual fleshly body of the individual would be resuscitated. This teaching Mr. Major formally, and in language admitting of no ambiguity whatever, repudiated. That is, in interpreting this article of the Creed he definitely denied the fact which the Creed affirmed. In so doing he claimed the right to retain and exercise his ministry in the Church of England. As you are aware, the three Professors of Divinity in the University of Oxford, to whom as "Inquisitors" the bishop submitted his reply, severally supported his contention, and with this the Bishop, in his formal judgment, concurred. You are further

aware that the appeal of the plaintiff to the Archbishop of Canterbury entirely failed.

I submit that in this case we have the judgment of the highest authority of the Anglican Communion that "fixity of interpretation is *not* of the essence of the Creeds," and that interpretation, if in the light of the ever-growing Truth, may even, without disloyalty to the essential ideas underlying the words of the Creed, involve denial of a creedal statement. Surely there is no disloyalty here. The framers of the Creed were setting forth the most fundamental of all beliefs involved in the very acceptance of the idea of God; namely, that the personality of man survives the dissolution of his physical organism. In the absence of all biological knowledge, and with the inheritance of an apocalyptic eschatology, how else could they declare this tremendous truth than by affirming the literal resuscitation and reassembling of the particles of which our bodies are composed? Should we demand of them a knowledge of cell chemistry which was not made known to man until modern times? You and I know that among the trillions of cells which composed our organism are particles of germinal matter once forming portions of thousands of human bodies of the past. Shall we criticize Christians of a former day because they were unaware of this fact? On the other hand, loyalty to Him who is the Author of Truth demands that with the phraseology of venerable formularies we correlate the vast stores of new truth which God is ever revealing; and that, when necessary, we explain their phraseology in the light of such new knowledge.

It is in this sense, then, that I would look at the early Roman baptismal symbol which we call the Apostles' Creed. I desire ever to probe beneath its words to its ideas; to interpret the unchanging truths of religion which its framers endeavored to set forth, in the light of the accumulating stores of knowledge given by that Spirit whom Christ promised would continually guide the Church into all the truth. Must I abandon my ministry and be ejected from the Church I love in order to do this?

I pass now to my belief in Jesus Christ our Lord. From my heart I believe that Jesus is the Portrait of the Invisible God, the perfect revelation of my Heavenly Father. When I ask myself "What is God like?" I can only answer, "He is like Jesus," and hence I can make my own the words "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." But I cannot make my own either Platonist or Aristotelian explanations of the metaphysical relation between our Lord and the Father. I do not know what that metaphysical relationship may be, and I know that no one else on earth knows. For that revelation we must all alike wait for the clear light of the other world, and be content while here to say with St. Paul, "Now I know in part"; "I count not myself yet to have apprehended." The Church in every age of its checkered career has endeavored to express anew, with the best thought and philosophy of its day, this relationship. But from the nature of the case, it is impossible precisely to define the undefinable. It is easy to say, "Jesus is God"—alas! too easy. Such an affirmation, when we try to

think through its meaning, brings us at once into the arid region of discarded metaphysical thought; in which, during the endeavor to keep clear the subtle meaning of such terms as Ousia, Hypostasis and Persona, it is well nigh impossible to avoid the Scylla of "dividing the Substance" without making shipwreck upon the Charybdis of "confounding the Persons." It is so remote, either from the teaching of Christ, or from the hunger of the world for God to-day. It is much more in accordance with the Gospel to realize with St. Paul, that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," and to have as the ideal of one's life the mystical thought of the same great Apostle: "I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in flesh, I live in faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." I would endorse the words of the Rev. C. E. Raven, a clergyman of the Church of England, and until recently Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, who in a sermon before the University of Cambridge a year ago spoke as follows:

"We search the writings (of the orthodox traditionalists of to-day) to find the bread of life, for which the world is hungering. And we find, alas! that it should be so, only the stones of ancient formularies, the scorpions of ancient superstitions. Take one instance. Nothing is more obviously vital than the restatement of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Biology and psychology have profoundly modified the whole content of the words of God and man. Critical science has recovered for us a fresh portrait of Jesus,

and yet the heirs of Catholicism have hitherto only given us treatises based upon the historical accuracy of the Fourth Gospel and couched in terms of the question-begging formula of Chalcedon."

And I gladly make my own the weighty words of another Anglican clergyman, the late Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. In his preface to *The Cambridge Theological Essays* he says:

"There is room in theology for the new as well as for the old, and each age, as it passes, must contribute to the store and not merely preserve and pass it on . . . The times have moved on, bringing new workers, new facts, new ideas, glimpses even of whole fields of thought unknown to us then; and room must be found for these in our theology as well as in other departments of study. It is no disloyalty to the past to endeavor to keep pace with the present, or prepare for a future which is already coming into sight. Theologians above other men are tempted to regard what is novel as suspect or even self-condemned; does not the Queen of Sciences teach eternal and unchangeable truth? Was not the faith, it will be asked, *once for all delivered to the saints?* But those who urge this plea forget that there is another point of view which is not to be overlooked. If there are things new, as well as things old in the store of the spiritual householder, it is his duty to give prominence to each of these aspects of truth in its own place. The New Covenant, no longer new in point of time, possesses what the Old Covenant lacked, an inherent power of presenting

itself in fresh lights, and of developing points of contact with the latest revelations of human knowledge. The Logos, as an early Christian writer has finely said, though He was of old, even from the beginning, manifested Himself anew at the Incarnation, and is evermore being born into a fresh, young life in the hearts of the saints; through her progressive realization of the Christ, the Church is enabled continually to renew the vitality of her early days, while there are epochs in her long history when the Eternal Truth appears with the startling freshness of a great spiritual discovery. Such an epoch, answering to an age of rapid progress in other branches of knowledge, may be dawning upon us now, and it is not for us to follow the example of the Scribes of our Lord's times by overlooking or misreading the signs of the time. The disciples of the Word dare not turn away from any of the teachings of God in nature or in history because they may be thought to involve a reconstruction of some of their cherished beliefs."

As I read the scathing denunciations of many of my clerical brethren, who have rushed into print ere I have had opportunity even to frame my reply to you, I am reminded of some sober words of Bishop Gore in a book which last Lent you commended to the diocese:

"It is pitiful to see how many there are among the professed ministers of Christ who, in an hour of popular discussion of some vital truth, are proved by their perplexity or dismay, or by their uninstructed denunci-

ations, never to have thought at all seriously or deeply about the most momentous questions."

The newspapers, by their headlines and editorials, have in many cases already judged me and pronounced me guilty because I said in my sermon two Sundays ago, in speaking of Christ in His earthly life, "Very few clergymen to-day, who have been educated in the large universities—by which I mean places where science as well as classics and mathematics are taught —accept the idea that Jesus had the power of God." But surely this is only what our Lord Himself, in well attested sayings from our earliest sources of His life, clearly affirms; and it is is also what His earliest evangelist affirms. Thus, St. Mark says, with reference to a visit to Nazareth, that "He could do there no mighty work (elsewhere this term is usually translated 'miracle') * * * and He marveled because of their unbelief." Here it is clearly stated that Jesus was unable to do a particular thing, and that he expressed surprise over a condition which he had not anticipated. If St. Mark, writing about 68 A.D., had thought that Jesus then possessed the power of God, do you seriously think that he could possibly have written this of Him? Or, if he had thought of Him in terms of, let us say, the Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith in the Fifth Century, could he possibly have written it of Him?

A later evangelist, "The unknown Palestinian Disciple," who compiled the *Gospel according to St. Matthew,* evidently from the same fear, so freely expressed recently by a portion of the public in our

newspapers, could not write it of Him. For he rewrote the passage, completely deleting the ideas of inability or surprise. "He *did* not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." And this later evangelist follows the same procedure throughout his document, either by rewriting or omitting a given section in his source. There is no better attested passage in the Gospels than that in *St. Mark* x., 17. A man asks Jesus, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" And He answers: "Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, God." What does St. "Matthew" do with this passage? In his desire to avoid the disclaimer, he rewrites it, so that the question becomes, "Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" And the answer is: "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good." Now every scholar in the world knows which of these two forms is the original. Every professor in your seminary on Chelsea Square will tell you that it is St. Mark's. Am I to be asked either to withdraw my statement above or else leave the Church I love because I believe St. Mark's Gospel here and in many another instance, rather than what, in company with even such conservative scholars as Bishop Gore, I know to be a secondary source? There can be no doubt, in the light of modern scholarly research, that the above particulars St. Matthew's Gospel represents the beginning of that process of dehumanizing our Lord, which reaches its full fruitition in the Middle Ages.

With such understanding as I have I am sure that

in some sense there was in Jesus an Incarnation of Deity. My entire spiritual experience makes clear to me that His revelation of God is absolutely unique; that He is, as I said above, the very Portrait of the Father. But *how* this was accomplished is to me, from the nature of the case, a wholly speculative question, as to which I know nothing. It may have been, as with the assistance of Greek philosophy the author of the *Fourth Gospel* expresses it, by the overshadowing "Word," or "Reason" of God; or it may have been in one of the hundred other ways that later Christians have tried to picture it. But I am also sure, because the historic records of His life tell me plainly, that He was also perfectly human, with apprently the limitations of other human beings. If this be not true, and if while on earth He possessed the power of God, could He—to mention but a single illustration—have prayed to God, as so often He is pictured in the Gospels as doing? Is it not unthinkable that God can pray to God? Would it not be truer to say, with the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* that "He learned obedience by the things which he suffered."

But in thinking of what is called the Deity of Christ, mere intellectual assent or attempted abstract accuracy seems to me to have little value in comparison with ethical allegiance to His teaching. I cannot forget that, according to St. James, the devils have a most accurate intellectual belief as to the nature of God; a belief, however, which in his estimation, in no wise adds to their moral growth. Nearer the ideal and teaching of our Lord, it seems to me, as His ideal and

teaching are expressed in our earliest sources, is the thought of the Rev. C. F. Russell, Hulsean lecturer in the Anglican Communion, who, following the ethical conception of the Incarnation so nobly expressed by Athanasius, says:

"Who is it that believes to-day in the divinity of Christ? Is it not the man whose whole soul goes out in unreserving acceptance of the supremacy of love? Such a definition would include many who do not assume the name of Christian; many who, because they stumble at the creeds, would feel, and might even be told, that they had no place at a Christian Eucharist; many who within the last few years have fought and died for an ideal, for the love of country, for the love of comrades, and yet have stood resolutely outside the churches. Can we doubt that such men acknowledge the Divinity of Christ in the only way in which He would Himself wish such acknowledgement to be made the test of discipleship? The majesty of love has them in thrall.

There is a negative side to our conclusion as well. However loudly and clearly a man may recite the Creed, he does not really believe this great doctrine of the faith if he does not consciously accept the supremacy of love, whether as revealing the nature of God or as constituting the ideal and principle of true human life. The man who honestly thinks that in the last resort force is mightier than love, whether it be in the affairs of individual men or of nations, does not believe in the Divinity of Christ. The man who deliberately values wealth above opportunity of service, whether

for himself or for his friends, does not believe in the Divinity of Christ. In a word, we deny that He is Divine whenever we set anything save love on the throne of the universe or of the individual heart."

I trust, dear Bishop Manning, that I have clearly answered your letter and that you will believe my words to be without conscious equivocation or mental reservation of any kind whatever. What I have written is taught publicly by great numbers of clergymen in the Anglican Communion, including not a few Bishops, and probably the majority of her most illustrious scholars. It would have been a simple matter to multiply quotations from representative Anglican teachers. But perhaps sufficient for our purpose have been cited. If at any time I may have seemed to have expressed myself crudely, I sincerely regret it.

In conclusion I would say *ex animo* with St. Paul, that "the Lord (i.e., the Christ of experience) is the Spirit." Might I venture to add the conclusion of his sentence, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty?"

Very faithfully yours,

PERCY STICKNEY GRANT.

P. S.—In accordance with the example set by you, I am giving copies of this letter to the press.

BISHOP MANNING'S SECOND LETTER

BISHOP MANNING'S SECOND LETTER

IN REPLY TO DR. GRANT

The Reverend Percy S. Grant, D.D., *Rector*
Church of the Ascension, New York City.

My Dear Dr. Grant:

I have received your letter of Jan. 25 and have read it with great care. In my former letter I called your attention to the fact that in your recent sermons you gave the impression to the Church, and to the public generally, that you denied the miraculous elements of the Gospel, and that you no longer believed in the power and Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In view of the wide concern and scandal to the Church, caused by your utterances, I called upon you to correct in clear and unmistakable language the impression of your unbelief which you had given, reminding you at the same time that if you could not conscientiously declare your belief in the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostle's Creed, as to which my conference with you had not reassured me, your only honorable course would be to withdraw from the ministry of this Church, whose commission you hold as one of her authorized official teachers.

Your letter in reply is a modification of your former utterances, but, I am sorry to say that it does not re-

move the doubt which you yourself created as to your belief in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. Your letter is written in terms which are vague and of doubtful meaning, and not in terms which are clear and direct.

I note what you write as to the miracles of the New Testament, and also your claim that you have the right to interpret the articles of the Creed in a sense which in reality denies the facts which the words declare. There is much that I should like to say upon these points. Important as they are, however, these points do not constitute the main issue.

The real issue which you have raised by your own utterances is whether you believe that Jesus Christ is Lord and God, for if you do not so believe it is plain that you cannot, with self-respect or with freedom to express your real convictions, continue to hold your place as a minister of a Church whose whole life and teaching is founded on this belief.

It is this faith in the Lord Jesus Christ which you refrain from clearly expressing in your letter. You rather confirm the impression that you do not so believe, but you do not say so plainly and definitely. The terms in which you express your faith in Christ are all of them terms which may be used, and are in fact used, by teachers who definitely deny His Deity. There is no statement in your letter which indicates any belief on your part in Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

Your assertion that there are others in the Church who believe as you do is not to the point. Some of those whom you quote are far from doing so. Your

attempt to claim Bishop Gore and Dr. Swete as supporting your position is surprising indeed to those who know their writings. Both of these great scholars stand unqualifiedly for belief in the Deity of Christ, and if you have read Dean Inge's "Confessio Fidei," in his latest published volume of *Outspoken Essays,* you must know that he repudiates the idea that Christianity can exist without this belief. In this essay (pages 51-53) Dean Inge declares emphatically his faith in Jesus Christ as "the Incarnate Word or Logos of God" and says: "If I felt that I had lost it I should not think it honest to call myself any longer a Christian, or to remain in the Christian ministry."

The suggestion that young men of intellect and vigor will be repelled from the ministry if they are required to believe the Faith of the Church is irrelevant. No one can, with honesty, enter the ministry of this Church unless he believes in Jesus Christ as God. Full belief in the Gospel of Christ does not repel young men if they are Christians. What may well repel young men of high character and sound mind is any doubt as to the sincerity with which the ministers of the Church believe and teach the Gospel which they have pledged themselves to teach.

I do not wish to say anything that is unnecessary or that is needlessly severe, but, in view of your reply to my letter, it is my duty to tell you truthfully what the situation is in which you have placed yourself before the Church. This is not an isolated incident. It does not stand alone. For years past your words and actions have given grave concern to the bishops of this

diocese, and to the Church. By your advocacy of easy divorce you have shown your contempt for the law and the teaching of the Church of which you are a minister. In terms offensive and shocking to Christian believers, you have cast doubt upon the teachings, the services and the Sacraments of your Church as you did in your recent sermons. By your own utterances you have seemed to the Church to deny the essential Faith for which she stands. The suggestion that this is a difference between "low Church" and "high Church" is merely an attempt to confuse and obscure the true point at issue. There is here no mere issue between parties in the Church. The real issue is that of belief in the power and Godhead of Jesus Christ, and here all parties in the Church are at one.

This issue is far larger than the Episcopal Church, as the letters which I am receiving from ministers of other Churches amply testify. The time has come for all believers to stand openly together upon this matter of life or death to the Christian religion.

Let me, then, state clearly the reason why you are not brought to trial so that no one can misunderstand the position of the Church in this matter:

You are not brought to trial because your letter in response to mine is vague and ambiguous, instead of clear and explicit. Your statements are so phrased that they cast doubt upon the Church's essential Faith and imply your own disbelief in it while not quite fully and clearly stating this. Even though the Faith of the Church may virtually be denied and doubt cast upon her most essential belief, a court ought to be con-

vened only when this denial is in terms that are clear and free from ambiguity. You, therefore, stand in this position: You have, by your own utterances, caused grave doubt in the mind of the Church as large as to your belief in the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. You have been given opportunity to remove this doubt, but you have not done so. You have made your reply to me in words which fail to make clear your belief in this essential truth. There, for the present, the matter rests.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. MANNING.

BENEATH THE SURFACES

BENEATH THE SURFACES.

Our text is from the twenty-eighth chapter of the Book of Job, the fifth and sixth verses:

"As for the earth, out of it cometh bread; and under it is turned up as it were fire.

"The stones of it are the place of sapphires: and it hath dust of gold."

Our subject this morning is, *Beneath the Surfaces.*

To-day the earth is frozen. This wonderful poetry of winter is covering the earth with snow, but underneath that frost and snow there are things going on, or there are things that have the germ of life, and it will be very difficult in the midst of next summer—seeing all the foliage, seeing all the grass-covered meadows and hillsides, and all the products of the garden and the farms, and all the flowers—it will be very difficult for us to put this picture of a winter Sunday against that and say—After all, it is the same land, and the same part of the country; it is the same world.

There is a great deal below the surface of life; but some people like to live on the surface; they like to look at the surface; they don't find themselves interested in the things below the surface. That is nothing against them. They are not always superficial characters; sometimes they are naïve characters, that have not come into contact with such conditions as make

them aware of what is going on below the surface of any question.

Now one or two of the clergymen who write to the press have said that my interest in this controversy was the interest of publicity. It just happens that at the same time that these sweet-minded persons are speaking in that fashion the editors of the papers are saying that they have trouble to get from me the things they want, consequently if I object to what the reporters put in the papers, it is my fault because they are either peeved at my refusing to see them, or in lack of my seeing them they put in what they please.

The pigeonholes of the newspapers in this city are not filled with what I have sent in to them to print. I don't suppose I have asked the newspapers to say anything half a dozen times in thirty years. Of course there are many persons sending in sermons, speeches, views and all sorts of things, but I am not of that class. In fact, I have tried to avoid this thing called publicity rather than to attract it.

Then another statement made was this—that my point of view or attitude is governed by a certain personal relationship. Now that is denied by the fact that I am saying just what I have said for nearly forty years. Certainly I cannot be accused of saying special things to-day on account of any relationship which, fortunately for the other person involved, is not of forty years' standing.

Well, you may say, these things are ridiculous and nobody for a moment pays attention to them. But, at the same time, I have even had English papers sent

to me with communications quoted from clergymen here. Well, I said to somebody, think of one man in particular writing that way. I never said two words to him in my life. My friend said "Don't you know he is supposed to represent the Civic Federation?"

Now, the Civic Federation took a strong hand in closing up our Forum. You remember one of its members, Mr. E. P. Wheeler, brought in a resolution at a convention of our Church at the Synod House, and not only presented it to the convention but, as I am informed, it was printed at the expense of the Civic Federation and distributed in our convention to the members of the convention. That is a serious invasion of a meeting of a religious body which has to do with the laws and reports of various organizations—the most dignified meeting of the Diocese of New York.

Our Public Forum was not turned out of the Church because the Church was consecrated, but because, as a very important man in this town said the other day, it was the only free platform during the war. Why was John Haynes Holmes' forum put out of commission, was that consecrated? No. Why was Cooper Union shut up, was that consecrated? Again. No.

So I want you to understand that economic things have a great deal to do to-day with what apparently is treated as religion. Our Episcopal Convention is filled with corporation lawyers. There used to be one man there who if anybody brought in a proposition that looked at all like social welfare would jump up and say: "I move to lay that on the table." I don't remember a time when it was not laid on the table.

Some years ago I got up in St. Bartholomew's Church to preach a sermon before the Sons of the Revolution by invitation, and I was praising the President of the United States—I thought that was a very decent thing to do in such a society—and I paid Theodore Roosevelt a few compliments. Up jumped this same man and said: "I raise a point of order." I thought that was wonderful! I wrote to the President of the Society, Edmund Wetmore, and said: "Don't you think you ought to have your Society apologize to me, or do something about the invasion of the rights of your invited speaker while he was speaking of the President of the United States?" I never got an answer to that letter.

I am just telling you these things to let you know what a tremendous underground feeling there is in this town on account of what are called "Economic Views."

I have a paper in my hand, a newspaper "The Illinois Miner, Positive—Constructive—Progressive." It says: "Five union miners, under murder charges growing out of the rioting at Herrin, where imported strike-breakers, thugs and gunmen were killed, were freed today, by the jury which heard their cases. The Herrin case is declared to mark an epoch in American industrial life. Labor leaders the country over assert that this heralds the passing of the 'American gunman.'"

There is a good deal going on in this country outside of the churches. I hear there are some fellows to-day outside of this church who are walking up and down with placards. One placard said, "We have

asked for bread and you give us nothing." Another says: "Unfrock the whole bunch, bishops, clergy and the like."

This church used to be very hospitable to anybody. But when first the Forum began we heard things like that right inside of the Forum. That very soon had to stop. Why? Because other fellows got up and said: "What are you talking about? Why are you saying that, inside of this place, where the Church is giving you the rent and service and light and the opportunity free?" So out of the mouths of the very detractors of the Church came defense, and by and by more than defense, because some of them came to me and said: "We want to join a church like this." But I had to say to them, "I can't let you join this church because people would say that I was using the Forum to get members for the Church." But I want to let you know the wonderful modifying and softening effect of asking the street to come in here and have its say.

We heard read a wonderful Collect to-day. It is a Collect that asks for and commands charity. Now you know that the word that is translated charity in the Bible is really our word for love, so that when we ask for that most excellent gift of charity, we are asking that the most excellent gift of love be felt and exhibited here on earth. I know that word has in the Anglo Saxon mind a certain sentimental allusion, but there you have it, a New Testament word. "Little children love one another." That is St. John's word. The revelation of Jesus is the revelation of a God of

Love. If you are going to accept the New Testament in any way at all you have to accept that point of view. This parish had the honor of accepting that in a very practical way by taking into its arms and heart the street—Union Square and the Bowery if you please. And we got on wonderfully well and there were very beautiful indications of the effect of just friendliness and kindness and square dealing which I am thankful for, and the Church ought to be thankful for indications of effects as plain as conversion.

Now, Dr. Copeland, who is not any fool, a Western man, a great, big, healthy-natured man in mind and heart and body, who looks after the health of this city, told the bankers that there was a very great deal of unrest below the surface of life, and it would not be a hard thing to collect a million men at any time to express this discontent. Is this a time to give up the Church's great commission of love and to put in its place mere theological discussion — or old dogmas. These fellows out there said: "We have asked for bread and you have given us nothing." Are we likely to give them more by shutting up the churches? By silencing voices directed beyond church congregations by people so bitter as those men are—whoever they are?

To-day we must live more by reality. We must get at the truth of things. We cannot go on camouflaging. Here is this matter of marriage and divorce. If you want to know how people look at this to-day, go and hear Jesse Lynch Williams' play called "Why

Not?" Mr. Williams is a very witty man and for two or three hours he keeps the audience laughing at the very inconsistencies of the whole situation. Do you think the Church is going to be able to stand that laughter indefinitely; this expose of the nonsense in its position? Go and see this play. You will have a very interesting evening and want to go again, because it appeals to your mind—not merely to your emotions, but to your mind. Then we hear that all these women of America are getting up and saying they are going to have a change in the matter of these laws—marriage laws and divorce laws. They are going to have the thing broadened out, have the inconsistencies of State legislation improved by Federal legislation, so that there won't be such divergent possibilities as we now have between the States. And the women in this country are the people interested, because two-thirds of the divorces granted are at the request of women. Where is the Church coming out if it stands in the way of such things as this? It cannot stop what the stage is saying; it cannot stop what two million women, and more, educated women are proposing to do.

Then what is the use of trying to stop the voices inside of the Church that should point out all this—that we are living in an age of science, in a humanistic age, an age that trusts life. How to live is the question. We must try and find that out before we are dead. I have been trying to bring what psychology I know or understand into the elucidation of religious problems. It just happened that Professor William

James was a neighbor of mine in the country years and years ago and that possibly I was one of the first clergymen, in consequence, in New York, who used psychology as a means of explaining our inner natures and our behavior and the laws of our mind and the way we therefore could translate into common sense and every-day language the older theology and older ideas. That seemed a very sensible thing to do.

I remember a Year Book of ours published fifteen years ago, which called attention to the way psychology and sociology could to-day take the place of theology, and was taking the place of theology. I found in the *Evening Post* of yesterday that one of the English clergymen noted for his studies in psychology, is actually lecturing on it every noon at Trinity Church. What is going to happen to Trinity Church?

Now that is all I ask for. Let in the light of these things. Let us have the advantage of what moderns have found out. Don't shut it up in a college. The colleges are filled with students and I am sure when those thousands and thousands of college students get out in the world they are not going back hundreds of years for the things they are interested in. Think of the Columbia College having twenty thousand students every year, including the Summer School. Think of those Western State Universities, all of them having more than eight thousand students each.

Somebody sent me a clipping from a Columbus, Ohio, paper, an exceedingly well-written thing, and it said that a college student said to this gentleman: "I don't understand how Professor So-and-So (a profes-

sor of science) can tell us one thing in the class room and on Sunday at the Bible Class tell us something entirely different." That is what the Church is doing.

The good of everything we are saying to-day is, in my opinion, that it strengthens the position of religion, because, as I have quoted so many times, William James says, "Religion is indestructible." Because, he says, from the subliminal self there are constantly promptings and ideals coming down to the conscious self, which urge it upward and onward. What do you want from a clergyman more than that?

We cannot get away from religion. Those boys on the sidewalk think they have got away from religion. When I met Socialists for the first time I was amazed. They said religion is nothing,—only a scare the priests got up to help out kings and millionaires. It is something that the priesthood put over on the people, a fraud, an invention, a dope. That is what they think. We do not think that and to-day we have these profound scientists of human nature coming to our assistance and saying that religion is an instinct of our consciousness. We cannot get rid of it, because our consciousness is a Siamese twin kind of thing. There is the sublimated and the every-day consciousness. There is the ideal and the practical, and a time to carry out the ideal and a time to form the ideal. So it is a very splendid sign of the times that in Trinity Church you can go in and listen to these lectures on psychology by this eminent man from England, who is lecturing there at noon. Go in and listen to him. They have a very fine rector there, Dr. Stetson.

Now we remember who it was said, God is very near to you, even in your own hearts. The vital power of life, the vital inspiration of life must be you and me from the fact that we are here and a part of this marvelous universe, so marvelous that you and I have no conception of it. I have talked with so many people lately that I have got some of the things mixed up—that is, as to who said them. But here is something somebody said yesterday, perhaps I am not putting it verbatim, but this is the significance of it.

A group of people had been invited to inspect the Lick Observatory out in California. They had been shown moving pictures of the formation of the planets, of new worlds, etc., and then they were told about the distance of these remote stars from the earth, and how many thousands of years it took the light from one of those stars to get here, so that perhaps the light we saw from a star started just about the time Jesus was born. That was extraordinary. After they were shown all these courtesies and wonders the party left, but presently one of the party came back and said to the astronomer: "Do I understand you to say that the light we saw from that star you pointed out took thousands of years to get to this earth?" and the astronomer said, "Yes, you are correct in understanding what I said." The man took a deep breath, and said: "Well, after all, I don't know now whether I am just as crazy to elect Roosevelt this Fall as I was."

This earth is such a tremendous affair that it is essential to take just as broad views of everything as we can, and we still find there is a big margin between

what the universe is trying to do and our puny thought.

Now I cannot walk a block these days without having a man or woman come up and say very pleasant things. But it is not what they say about any views of mine that interest me so much as to hear them say: "We want emancipation, spiritual emancipation, intellectual emancipation." And there are millions that below the surface of their daily life are eagerly demanding this, and mightily needing this and humbly praying for this. I guess that is the reason why we are here this morning. (A Voice: "That is it, Doctor!")

There you have it, and if there were more voices as courageous they would probably say the same thing. We don't want to go on burdened in our thinking, and fussed and scared in our dreams by things that we should not be asked to carry on our minds. This is a time of wonderful liberation and we might as well get the benefit of it.

I don't regard myself as just a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I have often said I can say all I have to say on the street corners. I can look out of my window at the tearing down of those splendid houses across the way, and see there children with little wagons carrying off the wood. They are a very orderly little group. Some of them have hatchets and they can chop up, or saw up the pieces and pack them in boxes and carry them off. One of them had a big trunk on a soap box on wheels. I said to myself: "What interesting and varied uses soap boxes are put to."

Now years ago we used to have street preaching from this parish. We had a Mayor's permit, which I suppose is on record, if anyone doubts my statement, and we had an organ and a cornet player, and the Vicar of that time for the Chapel (his father was a very distinguished revivalist preacher), and I would go around to different parts of Greenwich Village. The thing which interested me was the speed a crowd would assemble, and the steadiness with which they would stand and listen to what he had to say. People want to hear straight talk and they don't have to go inside of churches—perhaps quite the contrary—to hear straight talk. So I have never regarded myself as simply a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

I was telling somebody the other day that I never preached down to my congregation. I never said—These people in front of me don't know very much, and I have got to give them kindergarten material, to treat them as a primary school, or something of that kind. I have never done it. That is the trouble. As I said to the Bishop: I have treated my congregation as though they were members of the Century Club, and the Century Club considers itself a pretty high-brow club. I have treated them as though they were guests at my table, discussing and presenting on equal terms what is the best thing in my thought. I take myself seriously as a religious teacher whose findings should well go beyond the door which seems so near to the pulpit and embrace those bitter men parading on the outside as well as the people on the inside.

That is my idea of the church. It is not a little club; it is a great and inclusive affection, with little stations like this here and there into which it can call the multitude for whatever benefit comes from friendliness, from the thought that we are all God's children, from the sweet and devout usages of prayer, from the stimulation of lifting up our voices together in great hymns, and in hearing strong, splendid voices from the past of the same nature as the encouraging and uplifting and brotherly voices of the present. That is the kind of a church that we want to-day. So far as I can see, that is the only kind of a church that has an excuse amid our one hundred and ten millions of people. A church that does not talk either to a congregation inside of walls or to empty seats, but talks to mankind everywhere and founds what it has to say upon the great laws of life that cannot be gainsayed or denied, but are the findings of the best knowledge of our times; that appeals to you because you find it explains yourself to yourself and thrills you to take advantage of this marvelous miracle of humanity, no longer with the complacency of the past, but in the position of the runner when the starter holds the revolver over the expectant line, every muscle tense to run that race. Then think of the race! Think of those great strides, that take in the hurdles not as a jump but as a stride! Then think of your living your life in some such way as that, not merely indolently, not merely selfishly, not merely complacently, but with all that great vigor necessary for the activity which brings the power to act without exhaustion. And unless you lead

your life with that spiritual strenuousness the spirit within you grows dim, the life within you is dried and withers, and the miracle of human living put in your mind has been misunderstood.

So, to-day, as I understand it, what we want to do is to unify all sides of our life so that they will pull together. We need to have our education, our religion, our business life, our social life—we need all these things pulling in one direction and not pulling against each other. That is the trouble with most of us. The trouble with most of the religion to-day is that it is pulling against the other things in the world—the rise of new economic points of view, new psychological enlightenment, new sociological development. Do we want to waste our time fighting these things which are part of a great march of historical and scientific events?

An artist—Mr. C. J. Post—sent me a picture a day or two ago of a large etching, "The Letter Killeth." Now a great many of these pictures are symbolical and we do not know what the symbols mean because they are confused. But the idea is plain in the symbolism of this picture. In the distance are churches, and in a ditch-like road priests and ministers are confusedly and crowdedly passing along, singing, chanting, or are in intense controversy and fanatical discussion. On a raised bank near them stands a mystic figure of the Christ, looking at them with unutterable sadness. In the right background are great mills and factories. Near the feet of the Christ are little famished children, and sticking out of the ground are the implements of war. These ministers hurrying past the sor-

rowful face of Christ are paying no attention to the great sorrows of life. They are in their robes, and some of them have on the marks of high rank, but they are consumed with their personal controversies, and have no contact with the ills of life to relieve them.

Is that the sort of church you want? Do we clergymen want to give such an impression to those men out on the street or to this artist who drew this picture?

Well, all these things are below the surface of our every-day life. Don't you think it is a time for the Church to be again a profound inspiration, to art and artists? Don't you think it should be the clarifier and sweetener of such bitter minds as have been walking up and down in front of this Church this morning —nobody knows from where? And don't you think we had better get busy quickly and try to take the true Gospel of Life from Jesus? And with that try to become one mighty America, an America that loves the people, and trusts the people, an Abraham Lincoln's America? Which then can lead, light and help the world.

OLD AND YOUNG

OLD AND YOUNG

Our subject this morning is, *Old and Young,* and the text is from the CXLVIII Psalm, the twelfth verse:

> "Young men, and maidens; old men and children;
> Let them praise the name of the Lord."

That represents what many of us think religion ought to do. It ought to give happiness to young and old; it ought to put them in the frame of mind to praise the extraordinary miracle of life and to live their lives as if they were constantly uttering a song of praise.

I have been interested in the last few weeks (having received hundreds of letters of all kinds and many of them very interesting) to notice that there are two classes particularly that found themselves much concerned with the recent discussion.

One class was that of young men—some young women, but mostly young men—and their point of view was that, starting as they were with life, they did not want to start with any more handicaps than possible; they did not want to start with any more burdens than possible; they did not want to penetrate any more jungles or mysterious and cloudy regions of thought than possible. In other words, they wanted to economize all their energies for the hard race of life, its discoveries, its inventions, its social and personal

progress, and so they all ask for freedom and liberty, particularly in those matters for which there is no decided answer in this world.

Then there are the old men who say very frankly: "I am an old man, but I want to see some progress, I want to see some of this religious confusion dissipated, I want to see greater individual freedom before I die."

So both these young men and old men unite in a desire for greater freedom. Well, you would have quickened emotions of sympathy if you could read some of these letters that I have received. Here is a man who says:

"Now is your chance to tell the public the truth about religion, because you have the largest audience now that you will ever have again (laughter). Don't wait to tell your best on the soap box, because when the pulpit drops you then the press will silence you the balance of your life. I was turned out of the Methodist Church nearly twenty years ago for heresy, and I am sending you a few leaves from a book that I had published when I got financially able that fully explains my case."

He says very pleasant things in the course of all this. "Again I wish to warn you to make good use of the pulpit and press while you have the chance." There is one friend.

Now, here is a young man of New York City:

"This is just a word of approval from one of those college students to whom you referred on Sunday, January 21, who could not come back home and swallow whole anything the Church felt disposed to feed her

imagination with. But my religion received its first jolt years before that. My Sunday School teachers looked very much grieved if I asked a question or pretended not to hear. Is anyone so deaf as a Sunday School teacher when a question is asked?

"My second jolt came when I took up geology and physical geography in High School, for I couldn't reconcile what I was learning with what I had been taught in Church and Sunday School. It didn't seem to bother the others. Good students they were who learned their lessons by rote and found no connection between life and what they studied and therefore sought no reconcilement.

"But the hardest jolt came when I entered college. I came in contact with others who were not satisfied with the discrepancies between religion as served them and the sciences as laid before them. The scientific world was willing and anxious to discuss, while the religious world raised its eyebrows in a most shocked and grieved manner at the sound of a question. And we said to ourselves why is one so anxious to discuss, the other to conceal.

"Four years after entering college I was teaching High School in a small town in the middle West. One day one of my Ninth Grade pupils interrupted the class to say, 'Is the story of Jonah and the whale true?' It seemed such a foolish question and my four years away at school among people whose thought had warped my recollection of the religious etiquette back home and without a moment's hesitation I said, 'No, the Church isn't teaching such things to-day.' A few

days later the boy came to school and showed me triumphantly his Sunday School quarterly which contained a complete lesson on Jonah and the Whale, saying, 'And I thought you said it wasn't true.' I realized that this child would probably carry home my answer and that my position was at stake. There was only one answer that I could give and the ridiculousness of it is significant. I said: 'Then it is true if they tell you; it is true, of course it is.' My position was just like that of so many of these ministers to-day. We have our convictions but not the courage to stand by them when our salaries are at stake.

"I have worked among ministers for three years and I know several whose place it is to come out now and stand by you, but they are not doing it," etc.

There is a college student.

Then: "Permit me to say that I believe you are doing a work which will go far toward making religion once more a prime mover in the lives of educated people, particularly among the younger generation. As a member of the much discussed and criticized younger generation I can assure you that the unreasonable insistence of the church on creeds and dogmas has done more to alienate the young people from Christianity than any other single cause. The average young person with scientific and historical training finds the tenets of theological dogma formulated by uneducated, and, by necessity of their training, thoroughly prejudiced men, so distasteful that his first tendency is to discard the substance of religion along with the worn-out garments. If only the church could learn to teach

that which Christ taught; to make his word live again as an everyday code of ethics. If only the church could admit its own human infallibility and so open itself to evolutionary improvement, what a much more powerful institution she might readily become in this increasingly enlightened age. Please pardon my youthful enthusiasm," etc. "But I should like to say that you have in your work not only my deepest sympathy and respect, but also that of my friends who are for the most part members of the University Circle here in Boston."

Well, that is another young man.

I was pleased to receive a visit from a representative of a great university and a newspaper published by it a day or two ago. I promised, if I could find time, to write for his college paper something on his subject. He wanted considerable of an article, around 2,000 words. He said the young men of his college—one of the largest and most important in the country—were deeply concerned and very much interested.

Here is a letter from a college professor of one of the greatest universities in the country. "The academic world has to wage the same war from time to time, but I think that, as far as better institutions are concerned, we have pretty well established the fact that we are here not to teach any preconceived doctrine, but only what appears to us to be true. And the difference between you and the Bishop lies, does it not, just here. To him the Church is a body of doctrine; to you, a living, a growing organization united by its ethical and social aims rather than by its creed."

That is from one of the most distinguished young professors in the country.

I was surprised to get a letter from the *Illinois Miner,* a paper published in Chicago representing the miners of Illinois. You know the jury in the Herrin case have just acquitted five miners of murder. It says: "It might interest you to know that the majority of the men and women who participated in the rioting there are good orthodox Church people. They go regularly every Sunday and believe in miracles and all the rest. They are also republicans and Americans for generations back. Some of the ecclesiastics would adore them." So that believing all these things does not seem to prevent riots, etc.

Those communications are just three or four—I won't say taken at random—but they happened to be in the last bunch which came to me and they pretty clearly state the position of the youth and the teachers of youth in the colleges. And there was one letter from an elderly man of distinction which I find I have omitted which I was going to read to you because it put the position of the older men, impatient at the superstition and mystification placed in the way of a greater clarity of religious thought.

I received a telephone message from a man who is greatly beloved in this city, who while a Wall Street man of large means is a liberal man. People come here to New York to get money for what are termed liberal undertakings. They call upon me and say, "can't you tell us the names of some rich men who are liberal, have liberal views." You would be surprised

how few names I can give them. This man happens to be a liberal who is rich. He says this pulpit is clearing the air for a whole lot of people. If so that is a good thing to do—clearing the air for a whole lot of people.

I said that our text should be taken literally—"Young men and maidens; old men and children; Let them praise the name of the Lord." Life should be lived in such an exalted spirit of participation in its miraculous beauty and value that we could be at all times in this mood. Life can be made long and life can be made happy. Perhaps you say, well, of course. But a great many of us are not taught in our religious training that those are desirable ends—either of them. Life was a vale of tears; life was a vale of misery; life was a pilgrimage—all kinds of things which discredited life. There was also a theory of life—the ascetic which created monasteries and convents, and took some of the choicest men and women of the world, thousands and thousands of them, and sterilized them in their imagination toward life, and their physical relations toward the future.

To-day we are looking at life altogether differently. Instead of preparing ourselves for death and having in our eye all the time what the mediaeval monk had, a skull and cross bones and an hour glass, we are doing just the opposite. We are keeping the hour glass, if you please, to show how fast time goes, but instead of a skull and cross bones, it is not incredible that we might have a statue of Apollo or of the Venus de Milo. That is to say, we want life to be beautiful, we want

it to be happy, we want it to be long. And knowledge to-day teaches us how to make it long. Do you know it has increased in the last 100 years at least 20 years on the average here in America. You know that the children of educated fathers and mothers have a better chance of life than the children of fathers and mothers who are not so educated. That is to say knowledge prolongs life. Knowledge teaches us how to live a greater number of years and knowledge teaches us how to fill those years with happiness and usefulness.

The Greeks paid a great deal of attention to physical perfection. Shall we say they were in error in so doing? when they could produce in their gymnasiums young men who could be the models of those great Greek statues, the finding of which is considered one of the most fortunate things that can happen. The statue of Hermes Praxiteles, was not that worth the labor of the gymnasium, of Greece and the development of the physical life of the young men and women of the time? Read what Walter Pater wrote about the Lacedaemons. How the young men down there were trained. How they had to leap into the river every day, summer or winter, to purify themselves, to strengthen themselves and make themselves hardened by contact with nature so that they might not be corpses crawling around, but have a part of the God-enveloping life. They saw a deity everywhere in every mountain and every fountain and every cavern. So I say we have a right in our time to a greater happiness, to a greater length of years, to a different attitude

toward life from what on the whole we have been taught by our religion.

The President of the United States in a speech at Muskingum College, Ohio, said among other things: "Let me tell you, young men and women, no matter what your fortunes or your life, the greatest compensation that will come to you to-morrow or next year or the closing year of your life, will be the consciousness that you have somehow been of service either to your friends, your state or your common country. That is the greatest thing that can happen to you"—consciousness of service.

I have said that I don't know anything more serviceable than the mother of an average American family. I have told you about dropping into a town in Massachusetts some months ago, where I found five or six thousand people and only one or possibly two families of all that number with a servant. Yet they all had good homes, pretty surroundings. A great many years ago in Massachusetts the idea struck suburban towns that fences were unsightly and if taken down it would give a larger appearance to the grounds around both houses. That extended to this little town, so it is a handsome town. And yet all work done in those little houses is done by the mother and wife. The light shines in those houses at half-past five every morning; they sit down to breakfast at half-past six, and they are in the mill a little after seven. When we are talking about service we think first of the doctor, or I always do, or great scientific students, but when we come down to the facts of life we see these wives

and mothers are the people who are serving the United States of America, probably more than anybody else. And when we think of what they have to do, they are in the position of a great-nephew of mine who is four years old. He had a birthday on the thirtieth of October and received some presents. The next day, the thirty-first, he received into the family a new little brother. Well, he was walking along the street and a lady came up to him and said, "What fine new thing have you in your house?" He said: "A football." That was given to him on the thirtieth of October. Well, another neighbor said: "What do you think about your little brother?" He said: "I don't think anything." That is the trouble with a great many of us. We don't think anything about these mothers and we are willing to have rather high views of service, when the service of this country is being done by rather lowly people, and when the great service in this country is done by those who after all are the weakest. They have to produce the children, take care of the children, take care of the home and do the cooking and in fact perform the services of four or five different positions—I won't say that ought to be performed by four or five different people. When the President tells us that the greatest pleasure and satisfaction in the world is coming from consciousness of service, why these wonderful women of America have a right to be notified that they are to come in on this and be very happy if they still have any strength left and are alive, on account of this fundamental and often unrecognized service they perform.

I received a letter from someone who said, "The difference between you and a high ecclesiastic is simply that he is a churchman and you are human." I am willing to let the matter rest there. I don't regard my work in the world the building up of a religious sect, but the enlarging of the spiritual girth of humanity. I am not trying to do it accidentally and unconsciously but intentionally and consciously, and to find all the information and aids and scientific data I can to assist me.

Up at the Athletic Club some of the instructors go out in the morning and spend an hour with this man or that man. I know a fine fellow who is out at six o'clock and eight o'clock and nine o'clock with men he trains. Perhaps he will run around Central Park with one. Throw medicine ball with another or this, that and the other thing, and winding up with a massage and shower. He is trying to increase the physical strength and mental vigor through the power he applies so that these men can go downtown and handle their business. Now my attempts are just as definite as that, only what I am trying to do is what is called toward a spiritual end, the higher side of a man's life, that is, what is called his personality, his consciousness or is called his psyche, his soul, to make it a bigger thing, to make it a stronger thing, to make it a merrier, happier thing, in touch with all the sides of this extraordinary life we are living. Now, after all it seems to me if we want to build up the church, the best way to do it is to make the church a broad and big and inviting kind of place.

One trouble with religion has been that it has believed it ought to crush humanity—in other words, that there was something wrong with humanity. It misunderstood human nature and the function of religion. Much of the doctrine as well as the discipline is not only archaic but false. Such as the theory of the fall of man and the lost condition in which we all are, as the result of Adam's behavior. "In Adam's fall we sinned all," was the old theology. A great many people no longer believe that, and I fancy they are not of the most ignorant or juvenile in the community.

I think better of human nature than that, not only from my contact with it, but from the amazingly valuable studies of men of science who have really found out what human nature is by very skillful analysis and experimentation. And there is no more doubt about the findings of these men of science in psychology than there is about the findings of geology. The Hebrews, Greeks and Romans thought there was a hollow place beneath the surface of the world, into which the dead descended. Nobody believes that any longer and little by little we will give up these other fables, and the old-time theory of the earth and the air and the heavens and the various spirits that were made responsible for everything. Error and prejudice have cowed mankind.

At one time all the men thought that all the babies had as their fathers spirits, evil spirits, and they took a great dislike to their wives not as persons or individuals but as representing a sex which had such mysterious relations. Some of the sex antagonism of today can be traced to this early misunderstanding, but

the fact remains that at one stage of his career man thought that all babies were fathered by spirits. That theory has been pretty much given up except in one case.

When I was about ten years old I saw a book in the place called the Hole in the Wall, in Boston. The title of this book was "Know Thyself." I was not even acquainted with the origin of the phrase, but found the book to be a description of the skeleton of man, the muscles and organs of the body. These names I tried to commit to memory, but if I had succeeded in committing them to memory, should I have known myself? Of course not. Ever since then I have been trying to fill out that skeleton with a profounder and more satisfying knowledge. At last I have found something that put spirit, mind, and emotion into this otherwise mechanical structure of bones, muscles and so forth.

If you want to know what I am talking about read the book called "The Mechanism of Character Building," by Dr. White of Washington, D. C.; or read a book written by three young women Ph.D.'s called "Taboo and Genetics." You will learn more from those two books about the modern ways of understanding your consciousness and your ideas and the evolution of religion than any two books I know.

Now unless you are willing to become acquainted with old and new things from this absolutely scientific point of view, you don't know what such a discussion as has just been more or less set forth in the newspaper means or where it is going to lead to. No cor-

respondence between clergymen can settle such a discussion. It is being settled in the laboratories, it is being settled in the experience and thought of humanity. It is as different from the milk and water of ordinary religious instruction as the irrigated Western orchards are from the worm-infested orchards of New Hampshire.

I did not become a clergyman in order to be a parrot and merely repeat what I found in the Bible or the Church fathers or the mediaeval doctors of theology or the leaders of the Reformation or the Broad Church School of the last hundred years. I became a clergyman because I thought the Church was the most human and beautiful institution or place from which one could show sympathy for his fellow men; get right down by their sides,—practically help them in all sorts of troubles and study with them the problems of their lives wherever the problems were being best solved, in economics or philosophy or prayer. One very attractive thing about being a clergyman is this: His associations are with people he loves through all their lives and perhaps the lives of their children and grand-children. A doctor is called in occasionally when there is sickness in the family, a lawyer is called in occasionally when his advice is sought, when there are legal troubles, but a clergyman is in relation to hundreds and thousands of people every day. He is at liberty any day in the week to visit them in their homes and he is very happy when they seem happy in the services of the church or when he meets them socially, when they come together in happy forms of

contact in what are called the Parish Houses, where the children and the older people do all manner of interesting and educational and useful things. I came home the other night about ten o'clock and even in the front of the Rectory I heard the laughter and the shouting that came from the Parish House in the other street. I could not resist, so I went through to see who these happy people were, and it turned out to be one of the finest companies of Girl Scouts in the city. The military bearing and the lovely sense of harmony as they lifted up their voices in songs of splendid patriotism, the ability to do things with their hands and intelligence, was something charming. A few days ago we gave a play in the Parish House. I wish everybody here could have seen those children give those plays. It gave the children poise, self-command, dramatic interpretation and opened their natures to a larger perception of the meaning of things. You read in Goethe's "Wilhelm Meister" the cultural effects of the stage. To-day we find a deeper psychological meaning in the substitution symbolically in the drama of the experiences the individual might otherwise think he had to pass through for himself.

In the Parish House we have all kinds of clubs, classes, meetings. We had a girls' club for years which had a maximum of about a hundred members and they were young women who worked hard in different places, some of the most attractive of them were in the great dry goods stores. Those girls were taught the history of almost every country in the world. They knew more about Shakespeare than I venture to think

ten people in this church know. They were taught how to write English and how to express themselves, and were not only living on a very high plane while doing those things, but they were sent out into the world with a new knowledge, a new appreciation that lifted them on a higher plane socially and enabled them to perform a more useful service.

Those are the things that a clergyman enjoys—that a clergyman is kept in contact with. What is said here is not the whole story. What is done there in the homes of all these poor people is a great part of the story which every clergyman loves. When I was a young clergyman in Fall River, so many of the people that belonged to the church I was minister of worked in the mills and had so little time at home that I used to go to the mills to visit them When I think of what some of those people have become I am delighted and amazed at the services and utilities of the church cropping out in those deafening weave shops of Fall River and blossoming into new power and higher purpose and freedom from bad habits and so many things that I will not take the time here to recount.

I mention all this as indicative of the line of duty in which churches are more or less expected to move, and the view of human nature which we are on the whole taking, and this is not a low view, far from it, the material of human nature is good not bad and has got to be shown and educated. This clergyman from England who is lecturing on psychology in Trinity Church said, "We clergymen have been telling the people to be good? What we have now got to tell

them is how to be good." And this is one of the great advantages of this new knowledge.

All of you remember times in your early life when there were mysterious whisperings about unpleasant behavior on the part of small children which was magnified in an awful manner to stories of insane asylums standing open to receive these children. Fathers and mothers were absolutely silent but there were dirty-minded persons ready to step in where angels did not dare to tread. The boys and girls who were left in this miserable condition were often the victims of very unfortunate habits. Dr. Worcester of Boston, when called to such a case comes with this new knowledge and sits down at the bedside of the little boy or girl, and presto, all this rubbish disappears from their minds and behavior like clouds on the top of the mountain when the sun comes out.

We are living in a new age and we want to have the benefit of all the extraordinary knowledge of this new age. We are not in a time for denying things. These are the times for affirming things.

I regret that my contribution toward life was not a great invention, like Mr. Edison; or a great serviceable business organization plus an invention like that of Mr. Henry Ford; or a great physical betterment of mankind, like that of the Rockefeller Institute and Dr. Flexner, in discovering a cure for the hook-worm disease, or like General Gorgas, who helped to stamp out fevers. But however small the thing we discover may be, we have as much right to put it at the disposal of others as had these tremendous benefactors of mankind.

I don't wish for a moment to be considered a negative kind of person. I am an affirmative kind of person. I can look across the street where they are pulling down five houses to make room for a big apartment house. There has to be a clearing of the ground before they can commence to construct. I want you to look at the steam shovel over there, that cleaned up the whole foundation of a building yesterday, that is to say, 25 by 100 feet. It shoveled out everything within that space in a working day. Think how long it would have taken a man with a little shovel to accomplish that. Don't be a hand-shovel man: be a steam-shovel man—use the biggest helps you can find.

A friend of mine was sticking to the individual shovel the other day. He thought he could shovel some snow in the country where he was living. His family had to drag him out of a drift and revive him; he has been ill ever since. If in his community there had been a snowplow with a motor attached or some horses, he wouldn't have been put in any such predicament as that. We are living in this way; our great powers, these physical powers we see with our eyes, are matched by psychic powers not occult but perfectly plain and intelligible which you and I must understand and use. Coué visited a hospital, here in New York, where there was a little girl who was lame and unable to walk. Coué went through his simple demonstration and in a few minutes this girl was running up and down the room with Coué and everybody laughing and clapping hands. In a world where such things as that happen by the simple application of what

I will call by the short name of mental science, don't you see what an entirely different point of view you have got to take from the old point of view?

And therefore with all we are hoping for and expecting in the church, we have got to work for the incoming of all the light that is anywhere in the world upon human life. Each one of us must get into the business of enlarging the spiritual good of humanity. I said the other day that perfected consciousness was a very great ideal of human life, and perhaps the highest ideal taken together with the accompanying condition of social environment to assist the perfected consciousness. Somebody wrote me a letter and said I said perfected conscience and if such a thing exists it is a fine thing, but I said perfected consciousness, a name students of this method use instead of personality.

There used to be a time when a great deal was said about the life of sanctification led by church members; they were saved; they sat complacently and listened to whatever was said, which seemed to them a repetition of what was taught by the Bible. There is no such thing as spiritual complacency, spiritual satisfaction, any more than there should be among the athletes of a college training for a great event. Except for the rest necessary to the increasing of their strength they cannot give themselves to the complacency of rest. They have got so to busy themselves as to be stronger every day, clearer in their minds, quicker to seize advantage or to carry out fortunately the methods of play in their particular department. I apply that to human beings in the church or outside

of the church, and that is the great religious call of the hour. It is unfortunate we cannot make that so plain inside of the church and so beautiful and attractive and so individually helpful that these thousands and thousands outside of the church for some reason or other will be, at any rate, within the reach of that form of help and instruction and reading.

There is a new knowledge of soul. There is a new knowledge of social institutions. There is a new knowledge of the worth of labor There is a new knowledge of how to make life long and happy. There is a new knowledge by which fear can be supplanted by courage and hope. And all this knowledge is in the possession of anyone who cares to have it. At any rate that is what this pulpit is trying to present, is trying to make interesting, is trying to make attractive, is trying to make effective—effective.

Young people cannot be fussed and confused in their mental life with problems for which there is practically no solution. They have a right to be introduced to problems for which there is a solution, and to methods by which those problems can be solved. I ask you to look at the problems of this country and Europe, not from the point of view of some theology but from the point of view of common sense. I ask you if you don't think it about time that the church should assist people by the widest enlightenment to such knowledge as shall give some solution to our present dreadful difficulties.

The Greeks had a great idea of beauty and they had a great organization of life, but as I have re-

minded you they had a very poor social idea. Three-fourths of their communities were slaves. Now we have got a somewhat better idea, but we have many difficulties in carrying it out. We saw that Jesus said "All men are brethren and we are children of one father," his Heavenly Father. That sounds very beautiful, but what is the practical result in such matters as labor disputes or disputes between nations that lead to war? Have these ideas any power or any meaning? Do they produce any results? You know that in this great conflict the world passed through each nation became absolutely racial and tribal in its ideas. Each prayed to the god of war with as much satisfaction as the other, and it was considered proper to call that patriotism. Then where does this enlightenment from Jesus come in? And what are we going to do about it?

One of the curious things about poetry is that people can say things in poetry which will be a little more acceptable often than if said in prose. So much has been said about the ideas of Christ, expressed in this pulpit, perhaps you would be interested in a couple of sonnets I wrote some time ago and which express a certain way of thinking about Christ:

THE CHRIST

I

A gift I have, a sore perplexity,
That pains me like a friend's farewell embrace,
Or unavailing grief o'er a dead face,
The gift of love which Thou has given me.
The hearts of men and women I can see:
Their hopes and transports, bright with heavenly grace,
Their sin and torture, twined with hell's grimace;

But I am dumb to speak my ecstasy.
How can I tell them all the love I bear?
Nay, would they understand my words or heed,
What I can do this utmost love to show,—
One utterance, one deed the world can share?
Like dripping breasts my heart with love doth bleed,
O, I would die if all mankind might know.

II

Would I could give that naked man my cloak,
And, Father, heal that leper's foul disease,
Could blot sin from each criminal heart, could ease
The laborer's load, give bread where starved men choke,
Would I could give them peace that are heart-broke
And pour new wine upon old losses' lees.
At every step the needy on me seize;
My hands alone cannot lift every yoke.
Then his soul heard: "Be rich in life, not gifts
That pass like morning dews; but give instead
A dower for all ages and all needs,
Thy soul perfect through suffering, till it lifts
The burden of a self forever dead,
From all mankind, and new conditions breeds."

I fancy there are many who will agree with the mental and emotional attitude of those two sonnets who cannot always see their way through the intricacies of theological discussions. Who can say if we follow the direction of either of those sonnets, the attempt to express love to the uttermost, the attempt to enlarge life to the spiritual infinities of Jesus, we should not be carrying out the will of the great power Creator and Strengthener, the God of Christ.

SHOULD LIBERALISM BE GENERALLY TAUGHT?

SHOULD LIBERALISM BE GENERALLY TAUGHT?

Our subject this morning is this: *Should Liberalism be Generally Taught?*

There is a text in Proverbs 11. 25:

"The liberal soul shall be made fat."

There is another text, Isaiah, 32, 8:

"But the liberal deviseth liberal things; and by liberal things shall he stand."

Now that word "liberal" may have an economic more than an intellectual significance, but, perhaps, for our purposes to-day it will be sufficient.

What I am looking forward to, and what I think, to some extent, is already created or wanted or effected, is something like this:

I hope to see religion as free to thought as chemistry or physics, and as little bound by dogmatic barriers.

I hope to see all departments of thought and expression, whether religious or scientific or artistic, or economic, pull together and helping each other. Think of the terrible schisms in the nature of Henry Adams, who was a son of Charles Adams, Minister to England through the Civil War and who wrote that book, "The Education of Henry Adams." He said he was given an Eighteenth Century education but that he had to live in the Twentieth Century. As anybody who has read that book sees there is a continual pulling

and hauling between the facts of life as he had to meet them, and the education given to him. A lot of people living to-day have been given an Eighteenth Century education, or worse, particularly in religion, a mediaeval education.

Now I happened upon a book called "The Jesus of History," by a distinguished Englishman, T. R. Glover. The first thing he said was something like this: that to-day the world is more sensitive than ever before to facts and we are dealing, you and I to-day, with the facts of our lives. When an automobile breaks down you want somebody who knows the machinery of automobiles; you don't want somebody who comes along and discourses pleasantly on literature or philosophy or the manners and customs of the Greeks; you want to have somebody who understands the machinery and can put that automobile in order to go ahead. That is what we want to-day, people who understand the facts of life, the laws governing these facts, and we don't want these schisms in our nature that are pulling against each other. We want all this pulling to cease, so that whatever we get in church on Sunday is a joy and delight and imaginative power behind everything we do in the course of the week, whether in work, study, painting or music, or whatever it may be. That is what religion ought to be.

I hope to see the time when religious experience and thought are based on such reliable foundation that we do not have to live in fear of being robbed in our religion by scholars or men of science. That dubiousness and fear and concealment have been pretty much

the attitude of intellectual men who also had profound religious consciousness, during the last one hundred years, that is ever since we have had a greater attention to scholarship and science as they affected the Christian religion.

I hope to see the time when all mankind will have a sensitiveness toward life such as Jesus showed, and will have the feeling of its beauty that He had, and a soul to obey its profound and wonderful laws.

Should liberalism be generally taught? Well, should we be celebrating to-morrow Lincoln's birthday if America did not believe in teaching liberalism? Where did Lincoln get some of his great enthusiasm for America? He got it from a poor little "Life of George Washington." How pathetic that was, his borrowing that Weems's "Life of George Washington." After reading it at night he would have to stick it in the chinks of the log cabin—his library shelf—and the rain coming in so injured it that he had to make some return to the owner who exacted work in the fields several days to pay for the little book that he injured. Lincoln got out of that "Life of George Washington" an intense regard for American independence, both as a national thing and as a personal thing, and the "Rail Splitter" you can well believe, out there in the Middle West when that was the frontier, believed in personal independence. If he had not had that great joy in national independence and in personal independence, of the thing called American, do you suppose he could ever have made such a thing possible—to have America free and all independent

and not half free and half slave. And do you think he could have gone through that terrible war, with that gentle heart of his, if he had not seen that whatever the necessity of contention and even destruction and death, there was the reward of a consistent country, at any rate on the statute books, in which all people were free and none could barter the flesh and blood and days of another.

And do you think that with such an example as that man before us, who to-day is probably the supremest model that the spirit of America ever produced in spite of those great immortal fathers of the Revolution and Constitution—do you suppose with a man such as that as our model American, we do not have to go ahead in every direction of freedom, and challenge and insist that freedom shall win. And do you suppose there is any answer in a country like this to the question should liberalism be generally taught, except the answer, "Yes, by all means and of necessity."

But there are many liberals who consider an emancipated mind good for them, but not so good for other people. A gentleman who may be here this morning and for whom I have a great personal liking and regard—he was educated in the same college as I was, which is always a bond—said to me somewhat to this effect: "Liberalism is a good thing for the thinking classes but not for the unthinking masses." Consequently, if liberalism demands that it be given to those people who have no power of thought there is only confusion and contention and not valuable results. Of course that, I suppose, is what you call the aristocratic

attitude, the aristocratic attitude toward the masses, and one that many facts in the history of the power of the aristocratic mind would seem to justify. But of course the facts of American life are all in the other direction; I mean the facts of the confidence of America in democracy. We found at the time of the war there were five million illiterates in this country. That is a pretty severe burden. Then there are plenty of people who can read but won't read. A lot of people think because you teach a man to read he is going to read, but he is often not going to read that which you think of value. Democracy is based on a fundamental truth—one part of this truth is that all mankind wants to get ahead. There is in each one of us what James Russell Lowell called the "climbing instinct." We call a person who wants to get into a more exclusive group a "social climber." That is not a bad nature. We are all trying to climb up higher than we were before, not merely in the matter of social recognition but in the matter of accomplishment, of clarified vision, of power over life, of intelligence toward those very truths and marvellous experiences called life, intelligence toward other human beings, men, women and children.

A week ago yesterday I was taken over to the Brooklyn Art Museum to see two collections of paintings, one by our own Ascension Church member, Mr. Deming, who lived twenty years among the Indians and who understands the spiritual side of Indian life and not merely the physical, painted warrior and hunting existence, and understands how the life of

the animals was thought of by the Indians. He has a collection of very interesting paintings there representing this spiritual life of the Indians. I was very glad to have an opportunity to see those remarkable canvases of Mr. Deming. And then there was an exhibition of Russian paintings. How funny it is, we seem to be crazy about everything Russian except its economics. We will pay five or ten dollars a seat to go to see Russian players and stand for an hour outside to get the seats we have already paid for. We will go to see Russian paintings and Russian players and Russian vaudeville. Well, so I went over to see these Russian paintings. Now they have done a very intelligent thing. They had a gentleman, Mr. Christian Brinton, who probably knows more about Russian art than anybody in the country, and has a very witty, gay way of talking about anything, engaged to stand in front of these paintings and explain them to the people, and he went from one group to another. Every art gallery in the world should have such a person as that, because there is no place where people are more at a loss, and there is no place where they will learn more of the beauty of life depicted by paintings if they had somebody to explain them. So Mr. Brinton was walking from one group of paintings to another.

But as I was walking away from the more crowded room something happened. A young man about six feet one or two, I suspect a Russian, with his hair brushed back and a high forehead and a fine face, came walking into the gallery with his baby in his

arms. I thought he was holding the baby around the waist, because the baby's feet seemed to be hanging down, but no, he had the baby on his hand like this (illustrating) sitting on his hand. He walked into the room as though he owned the whole museum, not in an ugly or proud fashion, but in a happy and joyous fashion as though we were all his guests. He didn't seem to be looking at the pictures, but he seemed to be walking around and showing off his baby. Immediately the whole business of the Russian exhibit and Mr. Christian Brinton and the several hundred spectators disappeared. He owned the gallery, that is to say Life triumphed over Art. And so as the ships in the harbor edge up to each other by some invisible force, so I edged up to him, and I said: "Is that your daughter?" He said, "Yes. She is eighteen months old." I said, "You are to be congratulated." He replied, "I think so, too." (Laughter). And this little child sat there as though on a throne. She had perfect features, perfect posture, perfect poise. She had a little round hat with flowers which didn't seem to have any top that I could see. The wonder of the thing was that this young man and his baby was as interesting as the whole show to those who saw her. No matter how great Russian art was, Russian life in the person of those two very vital and lovely human beings was superior to anything else, and all other things were passed by for that man and baby.

Remember that all these things are for life. Life must not be put into a vise or squeezed into some small social, or religious formula,—but it should move

around with the lordly pleasure that that young man and child moved.

Now it does *not* seem to be a fact that the mass of mankind cannot do any thinking. Of course if they have no education which enables them to read they can not do as much thinking as they like to do.

Our newspapers are extraordinary sheets, not what they were one hundred years ago, but great educators. We might call the newspapers a kind of correspondence course in all the amenities of life; how to get on with your wife; how to behave in your first dress suit (laughter); everything that touches life is put into these papers in a very agreeable form. So there is an education coming into every household, and every individual who reads a newspaper in this country.

And then there is an education coming to every man who tries to vote, no matter how hidebound in politics he may be a man cannot help hearing something of the other side. And we see what an enormous change in the vote there is from one side to the other, thousands of people voting a different ticket from what they voted before. Doesn't it show that the facts or arguments are affecting the mass of the people, the minds of the people, the most sacred rights of the people and the hopes of the people.

So I contend that democracy refutes the idea that there is a mass of unthinking people that you cannot tell things to.

I was sent a Roman Catholic publication,—and they have some mighty good publications,—better than the Protestant ones. This one is called

Truth and it is quite a large weekly in large type. And it is a good idea if you want people to read anything to put it in large type, because some of the people whose minds and opinions are most worth having find they have not as good eyesight as they would like. I am a great believer in youth, but I am naturally not going back on the other end of the human family. (Laughter). I think that young people ought to understand the old people a little better than they do. The young apparently think they are the conquering heroes, and all the older people are practically dead as a matter of course. After all, people over forty have a life of their own. They have something to say about themselves. They have expectations for the years to come. Ideas and enjoyments and happiness in the hills and mountains, and skill in their own personal employments. I like the *Journal's* editorials because they are big enough to see across the street. I think they would be read a little because they are so big even if they were not read because they are so amazingly clever.

But now this writer in this Roman Catholic publication called *Truth,* which has the heading, "This magazine is for the dissemination of truth concerning the doctrines, history and practices of the Catholic Church," says:

"NON-READING CATHOLICS

"THE NEED OF A WELL INSTRUCTED LAITY

"And still there are non-reading Catholics, even in an age in which necessity to instruct one's self on the great question

of the day is so apparent! 'Alas,' to quote the Bishop of Durham once more, 'Threefold care of superfluities, viz, of the stomach, of dress, and of houses, has seduced these men and others following their example from the paternal care of books and study.' There can be no doubt that the trend of the times is away from books and reading, much to the disadvantage of the mind and higher culture. To cultivate a taste for reading should, therefore, be considered one of the duties of the times. For all who are smitten with the love of books think cheaply of the world and its pleasures."

Of course that is a question whether they do. I don't think people are so smitten with books that they make the book the idol. If they are smitten with books why they might just as well be smitten with pictures or almost anything else, the end is in the book. All these things are simply contributions to knowledge and power in regard to life.

I suppose the Catholic Church would wish to select the reading of these laymen whom they urge to be reading men. Why shouldn't they? I myself would like to select your reading and I am sure you wouldn't think that I was trying to get you in a bad position.

But let us wind up this little reference to the Catholic paper. If the Catholic Church advocates those measures, which are approved methods of liberalism, namely, education and reading, why should you and I fear the spread of liberalism so? Why shouldn't liberalism be taught? Even conservative institutions realize that in times when radicals call upon conservatives to debate with them on open platform, everything under the sun, that the conservatives have to be well informed; able to hold their own. This, however, they rarely seem able to do, which I fancy

is one reason why open forums and public debates are not warmly approved by the conservative.

Every once in a while I get an invitation to act as chairman where extreme radicals and conservatives are asked to debate. Of course the conservative must know what the radical is talking about. They have got to have some approach or contact with that other mind. Conservatives themselves have got to be taught liberalism even if they are not converted by it.

Liberalism is not liberalism that is afraid of its own speeches. Liberalism is founded upon great hopes as to the future and great confidence as to the present inner goodness of human nature and its desires to get ahead; to be more than it is. If liberalism in terms of economics, or religion, or social institutions, is *not* to be taught the great masses of people, democracy thereby would be denied and even progress would be denied. The extension of education and the substitution of reality for fantasy has been the only way in which mankind has developed.

That simply means to say that we have all got to have liberalism and we have got to have it as much as possible, and by liberal I mean the new point of view founded on facts as exemplified and interpreted by the science of the day.

Science, which is knowledge of the powers of life, must be studied and obeyed. This will inevitably affect religion. The unthinking must become thinking in order not to hold the world back. The spread of liberalism is inevitable.

Take economic liberalism. I have told you how surprised I was at getting hold of that article in the Encyclopedia Britannica on Economics which gave the history of the labor movement in a nutshell. In India it told about the different castes. Out there in India certain men won't pick up anything off the floor. If a waiter should drop something on the floor he would have another caste pick it up. That is the division of labor with the Indians who arrange their labor problems by caste. The Romans arranged theirs by slavery. The Middle Ages by serfdom. Modern times by the wage system. Plenty of people don't like the wage system, but it is certainly to be preferred to the caste system or slavery or the serf system. In other words there is a definite and clear-cut and appreciative evolution in the method of social institutions and arrangements by which work is done in the world.

They are digging out the cellars across the way with steam shovels. Those men come very early in the morning. Many are there by seven o'clock. Yesterday they were down there in the dirt all the time until twelve o'clock, when I saw a big motor taking some of them home. Their clothes were the color of mud, their faces were the color of coal mixed with mud. I don't know whether they were shaved, and I don't think they cared. They were great big fellows, and healthy fellows,—we absolutely depend on such people, and I guess their children will be nice, big, healthy children. But I thought to myself those fellows must be awfully glad to have twelve o'clock

Saturday noon come, because they are working there under the eyes of the boss who owns the thing all the time, not just under a superintendent, and they are on the run all day from seven in the morning till five at night. That is work. Not like a lot of people going to art museums, as I did, or going to the matinees, or to get an ice cream soda, or to try on a hat. Those fellows are in the dirt doing things. That is what you call labor. Probably after all they have a larger self-respect and a truer Americanism than they could possibly have if they were one of the castes of India, or slaves of the Greeks or Romans, or serfs of mediaeval Europe or Russia. That is to say there has been an enormous evolution of liberalism.

Now there is another way of looking at this. That is, the soul absolutely grows by independence. I was quite astonished when I read what the psychologists had to say and they brought me right up to that point that the child has got to be cut away from the father's and mother's leading strings as much as the baby when it is born. Independence is the law of personality. It is not an insolent pride, it is not self-will, it is not some unpleasant thing. When an apple ripens and drops off the tree that is its independence of the tree on which it grew. It is not any insult to the tree. It is not ingratitude to the tree, but that is the way nature arranged things. When it had been filled with sweetness and expanded to the possible size of its growth then it drops, let us say into the hands of man for use. And children by and by get just as much from their parents as the parents have to give and then they have to be

independent. And one of the most singular illustrations comes from the misfortune of some sons who cared too much for their mothers and their mothers' interests. A young man cares for a girl because she is so much like his mother. That is a sweet kind of feeling, but as a matter of fact that attitude of the son who is so devoted to the mother has injurious consequences, and the daughter who is so devoted to the father. It is keeping a lot of men unmarried and girls unmarried and making a lot of disturbed psychic conditions, as we read about in the novels of the New England group of writers.

So that independence is a law of the soul and liberalism is supposed to be in the direction of independence. So say the psychologists. Evolution is fighting on the side of liberalism.

One trouble with liberalism is the lack of unity. It don't get together in the attack which it makes on conservatism which is generally highly unified in ideas and organization. Liberalism is all fringed out into a hundred experimental directions and roads, and when it comes to the time of election it is difficult to come together on one candidate and it is often defeated at the polls because it is indifferent as to unity. So unity is the very life of conservatism. This is exhibited in every kind of election. The liberal people are always putting up a number of candidates and getting whipped by the other side, where one candidate would get enough votes for them. Any kind of conservative is good enough for conservatives, but one kind of liberal is not good enough for the liberals. One liberal

says, "I like your theology but I don't like your economics or sociology." So he excuses himself from helping, and stays at home and lets you fight the thing out by yourself. That is the weakness of liberalism.

To-day liberalists so far as the church is concerned are being unified. That is a good thing,—in my opinion it is. These recent discussions have unified liberalists as nothing has done in a long time. They are getting together. They are going to be a bunch of sticks very difficult to break. Then too there certainly is a great appreciation of freedom and a greater knowledge of what justifies in a clergyman of experience and teaching very wide freedom of expression.

Now the real difference between the traditionalists and myself is something like this: They regard religion, and especially Christian religion, as a transaction. I regard it as a process. They are satisfied to have a theory of the world which involves the fall of man, a stern judge, a redeeming son,—whose death on the cross has vicarious value for them, so that we are saved by believing in His name.

The theology of transaction and vicarious atonement has been organized into all the parts of the Catholic Church, with its doctrine of the Mass, and doctrine of penance, confession, absolution and so forth. They stand by the miracle as authority in order to justify their belief in God and man. That is all they care about the miracle. It enables them to say the thing is right. If you say how do you know this is so, they say because the miracle proves Jesus had this power. I care about the miracle as a possible equip-

ment for man. They care for the miracles only as testing the authority they demand for such a scheme of things as I have just described. Now I care nothing about the miracles as authority, because the laws of the soul are their own authority. They are laws that can carry themselves out without your help or my help. The laws of the soul, in that phrase I have quoted from Milton, are laws that can enforce themselves. The authority of to-day must be that kind of authority. An authority from within that can enforce itself. I have a little pamphlet by the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, examining Chaplain to Bishop of Litchfield, England, a member of the Anglo-Catholic Party. Every young man who comes up for Holy Orders has to be examined by him. Last June he was asked to deliver a paper before the members of the Anglo-Catholic Conference at Birmingham. You know the Anglo-Catholic Party in the Church of England are those who hold almost the ideas of the Roman Catholic Church. And what did Mr. Rawlinson say to these people? "The only authority the Church had to-day was to preach the Gospel and to persuade." The moment it undertakes to have an authority of force or domination it is absolutely denying the whole great spiritual significance and meaning of authority of the Church. Now, isn't it an interesting thing that I can agree with everything that Mr. Rawlinson of the High Church Party in England says? That we have all got to be modernists in some way or another. And the only difference of opinion is where modernism begins or leaves off. Anybody with education can apply education to his religion.

That is what modernism means. Anything goes, anything you get out of the system of modern life, science, economics, politics, anything you please, naturally all comes into play when you talk about religion, which is not something up in the air disconnected from everything else. This is what I mean by process.

A judge when he gives his opinion, thinks and perhaps other people think, it has nothing to do with anything but law. Read what Judge Cardoza says and what he thinks about it. It is what I said fifteen years ago. When the Judge talks he talks from the education he has had, in philosophy, economics and so forth plus what he knows about law. So it is with religion. Everything you know comes into everything you are thinking about religion, or it ought to. So these good people who consider religion a transaction think they must therefore fall into that particular organization and be part of that transaction. That is an Old Testament idea, a part of the sacrificial idea that the pagans formulated. God promised to do certain things if you promise certain things. If you don't do what you promise why then God doesn't do what he says, and if you do certain things you get punished for those things. That to me is absolutely unethical as well as unscientific. Religion to me is a process of expansion, enlightenment and joy of the spirit of mankind. To-day we are understanding as never before what all that means, and as never before we are able to proceed and obey these laws.

I get letters saying, "You are undermining Christianity. You are denying your Lord," and so forth. What

a crude misunderstanding to say that because I don't believe Christ was born of a virgin I am destroying Christianity. What has the Virgin Birth to do with Christianity—the profound spiritual content of life as we get it in the Sermon on the Mount or wherever Christ spoke, or acted. The biographical and the historical elements in our religion are going to be changed, but the spiritual will become more clear, more impressive, more helpful and more wonderful every day we live. We cannot get away from it, and I am trying to show this to be in agreement with modern psychology. Spirituality is a process, not a transaction.

There are still many in the Christian Church who think unity means uniformity and that all men must believe alike in regard to the great truths of religion. Historically as well as psychologically this is a fundamental error. The historian knows that at no period of history have Christians all held identical belief, either in regard to God or Christ. Every type found in the Christian Church to-day, the Catholic, the Protestant and the Liberal, is represented among the very first disciples of Jesus. The man with the modern outlook is to-day endeavoring to make clearer that these divergent types are not mutually exclusive but represent different qualities of human nature and that all have equal rights in the Church of God. This is one of the greatest glories of the liberal position. When I came to this church thirty years ago I started a very beautiful musical service in the afternoon. I had had some musical education and I had a very great love for music, and intelligent understanding of it for I had

associated with people who were musicians. As a young man in Harvard College I had taken a course in music and we analyzed many of the important pieces of music, and in those days I read music and played the piano. I had a friend, a young man who played the violin exceedingly well, so between us we would get through the sonatas and symphonies and analyze them. Now the essential thing of this incident is this. This young man said to me, "Nothing tells me so much as music, nothing speaks so much to me, nothing explains so much to me as music." Are you going to deny what comes to people through a great art? When I started the Sunday afternoon musical service, there was a strange old person at the Church of St. John the Evangelist who said we were having sacred concerts and that was all there was to it, and they were not so very sacred either; but I said there are people who learn things through music who would not from sermons or books or any other thing.

By and by we started things at night in order that people might learn through economic truths as I had learned through economics. What I am trying to make out is that people learn in different ways because of the difference in their temperaments.

I have told you a story about the son of a family which had always been interested in literature, but this son took no interest in Greek or Latin or things of that kind, so the family were very much ashamed of him. He got into Harvard and the first thing they knew he was doing remarkable work in chemistry and went from that to some other natural science. Presently

they found he was quite a genius from his point of view of the natural sciences. His mind was unlocked by the great sciences just as his family's had been by Homer and Virgil and by great literature.

Now we must apply that to religion just as to the other sides of life. We cannot expect people to get religion in the same manner in every respect and as a matter of fact they do not.

I possess one particular sort of temperament. Certain aspects of truth are dear to me and I necessarily lay great emphasis on these aspects which meet my own needs more than others; but I recognize very fully that human nature is not cast into a single mold; if I am not helped by what may be called the Catholic point of view, I most gladly acknowledge that there are other kinds of people whose religious life becomes most real through such an outlook. And I rejoice that the Episcopal Church is large enough to include both. Historically that is what the English Church undertook to do.

I have been criticized for breaking certain church rules. I might reply that other schools of thought break other rules. Take the case of St. Mary the Virgin, for instance, a church whose point of view I rejoice that our Church can find room for. But how many rules of the Prayer Book are broken there? To give but a single illustration. At High Mass on Sunday absolutely no opportunity is given for anyone to receive the elements, for the clergyman does not turn toward the people and then wait for potential communicants to come up. Without stopping he com-

pletes the "Full Circle" and at once begins the Lord's Prayer, but the rubric definitely says: "And sufficient opportunity shall be given to those present to communicate." The Catholic has interpreted that rubric in the light of what he conceived to be the larger context of Catholic faith and practice. Most gladly do I accord him that liberty. Again I can give no kind of worship or semi-worship to the mother of Christ. Another type of mind is helped by such devotion. The modern mind has no wish to reject such from the Church, but if these men rightly claim liberty for themselves to interpret, may not the liberal be accorded equal privileges? And may we not hope both that we will cast off that spirit of unchristian exclusiveness and worship together in the bond of fellowship?

I have asked the question should liberalism be generally taught, and my final answer is yes, push knowledge with everybody as far as possible. Religion is knowledge and obedience to the laws of life, physical, mental and spiritual.

Everyone likes to pass on his knowledge. Everywhere in the human spirit there is this desire to give to others its best. So there is always a propaganda. Yes, liberalism should be taught and knowledge expanded, and we should trust the mind and soul to meet and receive these things and use them for their best advance.

THE RELIGION OF MAIN STREET

THE RELIGION OF MAIN STREET

The ninth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, the 36th to the 38th verses:

"But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.

"Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few;

"Pray ye therefore the Lord of the Harvest that he will send forth labourers into his harvest."

It is with great humility I use such a text as that, depending on your intelligence and charity for its proper interpretation.

I do not subscribe to a clipping bureau, but receive in private letters from all parts of the country, and from England and France, many newspaper reports, editorials and remarks in reference to what is called the "present controversy."

I wish to thank the newspapers for their intelligent handling of the position of this pulpit, especially in their editorials. This trait of understanding has been conspicuously shown in the best weeklies—all of them that I have seen.

I have only one regret. Some headlines have given an impression of personal attack or personal reference in my sermons, which is absolutely untrue, as you will bear me witness. I have made my remarks so impersonal that any opponent could sit here and listen to them without for a moment taking personal offense.

There is another side of these newspaper notices which has attracted my attention. I find that my newspaper critics are mostly to be found in the small cities. They are all about of one type. They assume that the belief of the Christian Church is a perfectly clear cut-and-dried literal proposition and that there can be no disagreement upon it within the organization. These papers from small places cannot see any evolutionary development of religious ideas or any historical expansion in the church itself during the ages, or any necessary to-day and at this moment going on. Everything is a stand-pat proposition on a narrow old platform.

As I was contemplating this discouraging religious attitude of the small cities and their newspapers, I received from my friend, Helen R. Martin, her latest novel, "The Church on the Avenue." The volume is one of her fascinating studies of a Pennsylvania town. The Church on the Avenue is a Presbyterian Church. The minister of this church while a particularly wholesome man physically, is mentally conventional. The author described him in these words:

"Like most ministers of the day he was an adept at twisting the most obvious principles of truth and right to serve his own security."

His wife asks him: "Do you think the Christian life can be lived under the present social system?"

His reply is: "What nonsense, my dear! No fundamental changes are at all necessary. In America we have the best social and industrial system in the world."

His wife answers: "You can say that!—when right

here in Leitersville we can see how merciless, even murderous, Big Business is toward anything or any individuals or any class, that interferes with its profits or its power! And notice this—the forces that do try to block the depredations of Big Business are not found in the church!"

Her husband, the Presbyterian minister, replies to her: "We owe so much to our big business men in America: All our philanthropies, our hospitals, our orphanages, the upkeep of our Christian churches, our missionary work in foreign fields—none of these things could go on without them."

His wife might have replied that the Pullman strike and the National Cash Register strike and the strike in Fall River, and many others have been due to the philanthropy of the employer. The working people were burdened by philanthropy and they said: "If there is money enough to pay for these philanthropies, let it be distributed in wages, and we can be our own philanthropists."

The higher institutions of a community ought not to depend on the caprice, good nature, bad conscience, or ambition of rich men, but should be the natural and inevitable creation of citizens, like paved streets or the water supply, or like the Boston Public Library, paid for out of a common chest of the City Government.

In the Pennsylvania town that Mrs. Martin's book describes, the Employer's Association tells the Christian pastors, the Young Women's Christian Association and the Young Men's Christian Association what

to say about unionism, about strikes, about public school teacher's salaries, and, in fact, everything in the town that looks toward a broad or liberal policy. Circular letters are sent to them listing the opinions that the Employer's Association expects them to disseminate and be governed by.

The Presbyterian minister says to the Episcopal minister: "We have always had peace and harmony in the Church of the Avenue and I propose to maintain it." The reply of the Episcopal minister is: "The peace of death is what you have had. Is that what you are going to maintain?"

As some of the most savage attacks upon personal liberty, upon freedom of speech—attacks that involve murder and imprisonment of working people—have been made in these Pennsylvania towns, Mrs. Martin's long acquaintance with them and close observation and study may be regarded as of value. Here then we have a situation in which the employers dominate the most influential organizations of the town, including the leading Church on the Avenue. If you analyze the situation in one of these small towns, no one cares very much about the theology of the ministers, except perhaps some old fashioned old ladies. What matters is the economic opinion of the ministers and what they say and do, when there are disputes between the Employers' Associations and the working people.

This falls in with what the President of the American Bankers' Association said at the Hotel Astor last night, that "all our struggles in America are economic"—a very significant remark.

All the struggles of America are economic. But religion has something to say about the economic because to-day the leading economists declare that a man's wages must have reference to his soul's development and to progress and evolution of the individual as a person; or they say, the wages paid must have reference to the welfare of the community. That is what the younger and brainier economists are saying. And if the struggles in America are economic struggles, then these sentiments so close to the salutary doctrines of religion must be taken into consideration.

Under these circumstances, what is needed in these small places is the fresh air of independence, backed by modern knowledge. Such a situation as is found there is a confirmation of what we have been talking about.

Mr. Sinclair Lewis, the author of "Main Street," has since written "Babbitt," which takes up another side of life in a small place. Listen to the religion of his hero:

Chapter sixteen, division three:

"If you had asked Babbitt what his religion was, he would have answered in sonorous Boosters' Club rhetoric, 'My religion is to serve my fellow men, to honor my brother as myself, and to do my bit to make life happier for one and all.' If you had pressed him for more detail he would have answered, 'I'm a member of the Presbyterian Church, and naturally I accept its doctrines.' If you had been so brutal as to go on, he would have protested, 'There's no use discussing and arguing about religion; it just stirs up bad feeling.'

"Actually, the content of his theology was that there was a supreme being who had tried to make us perfect, but presumably had failed; that if one was a Good Man he would go to a place called Heaven (Babbitt unconsciously pictured it as rather like an excellent hotel with a private garden), but if one was a Bad Man, that is, if he murdered or committed burglary or used cocaine or had mistresses, or sold non-existent real estate, he would be punished. Babbitt was uncertain, however, about what he called 'this business of hell.' He explained to Ted, 'Of course I'm pretty liberal; I don't exactly believe in a fire-and-brimstone Hell. Stands to reason, though, that a fellow can't get away with all sorts of Vice and not get caught for it. See how I mean?'

"Upon this theology he rarely pondered. The kernel of his practical religion was that it was respectable, and beneficial to one's business, to be seen going to services; that the church kept the Worst Elements from being still worse; and that the pastor's sermons, however dull they might seem at the time of taking, yet had a voodoistic power which 'did a fellow good—kept him in touch with higher things.' "

What a hodge-podge of superstition, and snobbishness and cowardice such a Main Street religion is! What inadequate standards! What childish pictures! There is plenty of the same jumble of notions even in large cities. That is why we are studying together the old beliefs we are better without and the new ones we had better take on.

For instance, I received a letter a day or two ago

from a Catholic who had married a divorced woman. She had been left destitute with a boy of ten years on her hands, while her husband was living with other women. A divorce under those circumstances and the remarriage of the wife is granted by the law of the Protestant Episcopal Church, yet this man had been told that he was living in mortal sin. This manly fellow who had done a fine thing, and was happy with his wife, was being made miserable and the stability of his family was being shaken by some one speaking in the name of Christ.

All this sort of thing, which troubles, or weakens, or destroys, must give place to enlightenment, to freedom and strength that joyfully grapples with the real problems of wealth and poverty as they appear in politics, in social institutions and in business; with the problems of health, domestic happiness, and personal joy.

Our prayer, a new prayer for the President of the United States, which I read this morning, asks that God take us under his Providence and that our offices of Government should be governed by righteousness. Well now I should have much more hopes for this country if they prayed that there should be knowledge, and good intentions, and justice in the hearts of all who hold office in this country, so that they have the quality and ability to solve our problems. If you have ever read that interesting book by Lewis Wallace, "The Sociology of the Bible," you will remember that the righteousness talked about in the Old Testament and which the prophets were talking about, is justice

for the poor and originated in the times when the Hebrews were a pastoral people and lived in the tent and were under the rule of the father, and all as brothers were treated equally.

The country storekeepers have complained because people in the small towns and villages do their shopping now by mail, instead of in the local stores. The country ministers are complaining because their congregations would rather stay at home and listen to a radio sermon than come to church and listen to them. Country newspapers may likewise take notice for they will soon be complaining when the city newspapers are dropped in hundreds and thousands of copies by aeroplanes all over the rural districts—taking the place of these little stand-pat newspapers owned by the controlling interests of the town and giving the local news of the town.

One blessing of a city is this—there are so many kinds of people in it—thank God—and so many ways of making a living and doing without a living, and thank God for that (laughter), that money is not absolutely in control. Now let us understand the blessing of living in a great city. Some people talk about New York as though it was an evil place, and you hear some of that talk in the West, but New York is probably the most interesting city to-day in the world. Let us be mighty pleased that we happen to live here and let us try to stay here as long as we can (laughter). A nephew of mine, when he went into business, said he thought he would go out West. I said "why do you want to go out West, everybody

I know is trying to come here. Fifth Avenue is built up from Pittsburg, Chicago and San Francisco. If you happen to be born in the East, stick." I always thought that the greatest order of good Americans will by and by be considered those men who came over last, whose ancestors were able to stand Europe two or three hundred years longer than our ancestors (laughter). Cromwell went to the seacoast thinking he would come over here, but something told him to go back and fight it out with the other boys, so he went back and fought it out. I don't ask you to take that with absolute seriousness but I think it is a fortunate thing to be a resident of New York. So I say be one as long as you can—unless you have to go South or to California for your health. What interests me is to think that with all of the variety and all the differences and possibilities there are some humane and lovely persons in great cities who conspicuously put their fortunes at the service of social workers, of journalists who are idealists, of pleaders for intellectual freedom and of youth trying to emancipate itself from the past and to achieve distinction. Persons who so use their fortunes should be encouraged. We have statues to the great emancipator of several millions of slaves. Cannot we put up such a statue to those sweet and generous souls who are trying to emancipate millions from clogging and unworthy inheritance of belief or prejudice or ignorance received from the past.

Abraham Lincoln said that "God must love the common people because he made so many of them." Of course, that is something of a joke but at the same

time the argument would apply to skunks or rattlesnakes. What surprises me is the number of people who make no contribution to life. That is the trouble with the most of people. They make no contribution to life except the daily routine of their toil for which they are paid. Perhaps in these small towns there is developed a physical and nervous energy superior to what is developed in great cities, though I have been told that military statistics make out a better case for the endurance of the city bred than the country bred. Even Abraham Lincoln got his great idea of the misery of slavery from a trip down the Mississippi, and what he observed in Louisiana of brutality toward the slaves. We must remember too that he had a habit of reading. Dr. Johnson said if any man read five hours a day for five years he would be an educated man. And the thing I like to see on the subway train or the elevated is a working boy or girl with a book, not a newspaper, though we get a great deal from the newspaper, but a book, reading on the way to work. In this country we must not be satisfied with a common school education; we must read books which illuminate economic matters, the laws of one's inner nature and social organization. Even that great saint, martyr, leader of simple democracy, Abraham Lincoln, in his idea of humor hardly got beyond the country grocery store.

Why are the majority of mankind so commonplace, so unambitious, except in the matter of pay, and so uninteresting in outlook and conversation? I should say because their education or their religion has not

given them ideas. Now in the previous generation Ralph Waldo Emerson gave out many ideas. He believed in ideas even without organization. There ought to be some new Ralph Waldo Emerson giving us a lot of stimulating, dominating, controlling, successful ideas. Too many of our people live in a world of possible good times and not in a world of good ideas.

We must take care that our religion is not the reflection of our satisfaction in an economic system that has done well by us, so that we fear any change in religious views not primarily on account of what this change may do to our souls but what it may do to our manner of life. Many liberal minded thinkers to-day view with tenderness the Christian faith and worry about any change even in interpretation or review of historical facts, etc., because they fear that with a change in theology there will be a change in economics.

Plato said that when the modes of music changed, morals changed. Many nervous Christians think that when religious doctrines change business will have to change. But that might be a good thing. Well, these prophets that we read about in the Old Testament thought that business ought to change, that there should be more social justice in such things in the world.

The President of the American Bankers' Association who comes from Milwaukee, said another thing last night. That America should have the leadership of the contented. The "leadership of the contented" is another small town idea. What does it mean? Why, the leadership of the "haves," of the successful,

the powerful, the influential and the leadership of the bankers, with their associates. Was Julius Caesar contented? Was Napoleon Bonaparte contented? Was George Washington or Abraham Lincoln or Jesus Christ contented? These were great leaders but the leadership of the contented would bar out the greatest leaders of the world. Has any great artist or writer been contented? Is contentment consistent with great ambition or high dreams or with notable accomplishment?

Father Huntington, a son of Bishop Huntington, after he had lived on the East Side for a while in the old days before the Social Settlement, if I remember rightly, said: "What we want to do for these people is to make them discontented, because we see they are being contented with dirt and drudgery and starvation and all kinds of things that mankind suffered in the past. We can do nothing to uplift them until we have made the East Side discontented." We cannot have leaders for America out of the contented until we have made them discontented. You have got to have the leadership of the *discontented contented,* of the man who has everything but who in his soul is unhappy and dissatisfied and not at rest until he tries to give everybody else what he has, freedom and economic security.

Now, I am far from believing that the religious life of small cities or towns must necessarily be small. In fact, there are individual examples to the contrary, but the business, social and religious life of small cities, it goes without saying, can be more closely interlocked together and controlled than in large cities. Just as

the life of some of the coal and iron towns in Pennsylvania, as we have seen in recent strikes—the steel strike and the coal strike—seemed absolutely to carry out the will of the employers, regardless of even the ordinary rights of citizens to free assemblage and free speech.

I have a letter from an editor in Wisconsin. He told me his grandfather was a Methodist minister and a circuit rider, and his father was also ordained but only preached for a few weeks and afterwards, I believe, was a Governor of Wisconsin. The man who was writing to me—the third generation of such a fine ancestry—expresses editorially all anyone could wish in appreciation of liberal mindedness and progress in America.

I have a very remarkable and very suggestive letter from a man, who, like Lincoln, was a pioneer, born in a log cabin and taught in a log cabin school. He says: "When I look back now, more than sixty years, to a time when the old dogma of a revengeful God was preached, who had prepared a lake of fire and brimstone into which he designed to cast, and roast forever all of his creatures whom he had without any ill or wish of their own forced into existence and who from natures which he had made possibly had failed to walk in the straight and narrow way, I am appalled. Even to this day comparatively few have the common sense or courage to see or avow what to the liberal mind must seem absurd.

"It was my lot to be born the son of a pioneer, and like Lincoln, in a log cabin, in the Middle West, then

the frontier. My only schooling was obtained in a log schoolhouse, where only the rudiments of learning were taught. My struggle to obtain a few of the comforts of life have impeded my efforts to attain to even a tolerable literary goal. But it gives me pleasure to have lived to see the sun of science fairly well along toward the zenith, and that the old dogma under which I used to shudder is gradually being relegated to an age of superstition and ignorance." That is a fine voice from the Middle West.

The trouble with personal independence and with mental self-liberation is this: The individual has to pay too high a price for it in effort, in disadvantage and social misunderstanding for his personal progress. We should make our environment—social environment, education, religious environment so helpful to these people that they would not have to pay so much of a price. We have often seen when walking along a sidewalk coming up through the cracks a few blades of green grass, but, because they insist on growing up through the cracks of a tar walk, we don't spread tar in front of the house when we want to raise a lawn. What we must do for humanity to-day is as carefully to prepare and to sow and to tend their mental and spiritual needs as a proud householder arranges to have a glossy, thick, green lawn.

The liberal movement in religion not only tells people that thinking ought to help their religion but it tries to remove many of the obstructions and burdens in the way of thought. Now many of these troublesome ideas have got into our heads from unlikely

sources. I heard a woman say how frightened she had been for many years by the awful ideas a colored nurse had put into her mind about hell fires and things of that sort. Rich people think they are doing well to give their children nurses but sometimes it is the worst thing possible because the nurse to secure obedience tells the wildest kind of tales that threaten and weaken the child's mind.

We must not allow here in New York the small point of view to come along with men of individual energy and try to dominate the great city idea. It is all well enough to have a good, strong, massive young man from a Western town who has learned something of banking come here and be Vice President of some trust company, but we don't want him telling us some small town point of view about religion, economics or social justice. I think that this great city of New York with its college boys and girls, its leaders in public liberty, and religious editors are trying to help forward the cause of humanity by freeing minds wedded to ignorance and superstition; and why should they not effect similar results in small towns as well. Why should they not send such clarifying patent insides to country papers? There are now patent insides sent to the small town newspapers of what is going on in political or other circles.

The Reverend Dr. Sheppard of St. Martin's-in-Field, London, perhaps the most popular clergyman in England, said that about eighty per cent. of the population of England had no organized church connection. Four-fifths of the population of England has no or-

ganized church connection. Jesus had compassion on the multitude because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. I ask if there is no intelligent way for the comfortable residents of this great city of New York to help the ignorance of New York and also the ignorance of other places in this country. We learned in the time of the war that we had five millions of illiterates. That is not such a problem as Main Street because you can teach a man to read who don't know how, but after he has learned to read, it is much harder to teach him to think, it is much harder to teach him what to read. And those are the things we are trying to do to-day, teach people what to read, how to think, how they ought to be vital, energized, up-to-date human beings. Why this life passes very quickly, I assure you, very quickly. I was called to this church thirty years ago this month. The time has gone like a dream. My friends have married and had children who have grown up and married. A generation soon disappears. We happen to be the living. Don't act as though you were a mummy in a three-thousand-year-old tomb. Use the great opportunity of life. You are living in this marvelous city, in this marvelous America.

[*A man in the congregation becomes unconscious and is carried out and taken to a hospital.*] I am very sorry for the illness of the gentleman. But let that show us that we cannot waste time; that we cannot fall asleep, if we desire enlightenment. We are strong and healthy. I see many young here with sunlight in their eyes. Be young men in a hurry to follow truth.

A FIRMER FOUNDATION FOR CHRISTIANITY

A FIRMER FOUNDATION FOR CHRISTIANITY.

Our subject this noon is, *A Firmer Foundation for Christianity.*

For one hundred years we have had the phenomenon in certain English speaking countries of persons of great seriousness, like Matthew Arnold, for instance, who were unhappy about the religion of their time. They felt that there was a larger and a sounder establishment of religion than they had been taught, or than was generally accepted. That great Englishman, poet, critic, educator, described his position as a passing between a world that was dead and another world that seemed powerless to be born. Matthew Arnold was only a type of the disturbed and almost melancholy tone of the Nineteenth Century. There are other poets; there are other men of letters who are of his company.

But think what has happened since Matthew Arnold's death to help a new world to be born, so far as the intelligence of man, looking at life, was concerned. Since his day we have had a new psychology. We had in the middle of the last century Amiel, who said that what we wanted was a new psychology. Well, we have got the new psychology, the laboratory, the experimental, the psychology of the psychiatrist of to-day. We have got a new economics; a new science

called sociology. Now all those have a great deal to say about the underlying ideas of religion. When you mention those you say nothing about what is called the higher criticism of the Bible, or the new studies in archaeology, or the new studies in biology and geology. What an extraordinary lifting and jack-screwing of our imagination has been required, when instead of thinking of this world as six or seven thousand years old, we have to think of it as from twenty-five to one hundred million of years old; and man, instead of being seven thousand years old, as being a million years old; and man, instead of being a perfected being to begin with an evolution from lower animals.

Now a religion that has an historical side, and yet was born in unhistorical ages; a religion that has a scientific side and yet came into existence prior practically to any science in our sense of the word, must naturally face what you might call the criticism, or the revision, of subsequent ages that are historical, and of subsequent ages that are scientific. And so those things which worried the Nineteenth Century thinkers I referred to—the retreat of certain historical facts; or of certain so-called scientific facts; the obsolescence of once received stories, theologies; many facts, the discrediting of old schemes of salvation, the passing of old social regulations—are inevitable—I say such retreat is inevitable, and the time has to come when intelligence perceives that much of the biography of historical and scientific statement connected with our religion is a thing of the past.

On the other hand, that was not the whole story,

the belief of another time two thousand years ago. Those so-called or supposed historical facts were of great importance. They were of authoritative importance, and particularly through all those centuries when mankind was looking for the end of the world. Think what a sad, pessimistic, gloomy kind of a world that must have been when everybody was looking for the end of the world. It was very natural that during such periods people should be saying—"What can I do to make myself secure in another world?" Now many of the things they did seem to us not of a commanding and essential sort. Moreover, how are we going to know just what that other world asks of us. If it is continuity of existence, why is not that continuity founded upon the perfection or highest development possible of qualities we see here are essentially human and demanded of us. What is the use of doing what we have all been doing for many years, trying to extend the span of life, so that it has at least increased twenty or thirty years in the last century, if we don't do all we can for life, and trust its laws.

And so the eyes of the world have of late been removed from a world beyond the earth—the anxious eyes, the worried eyes—and they have been fixed upon this great humanity, this great opportunity, this marvel of human existence here and now, this miracle of life which we wake up too late and go to sleep upon too early in the ordinary every-day existence.

A little while before his death, which was thirty years ago, I heard this story about Phillips Brooks: A young clergyman asked him what to preach about.

Bishop Brooks replied: "Preach about anything except the relation of science to religion. To-day matters have changed to such an extent that science has come mightily to the aid of religion, and in my view is the only stronghold from which religion can be successfully advocated."

Think of that great region in the New Testament that is the region of spiritual exposition, the region of spiritual analysis—I refer to such teaching, such revelation, as we find in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel—The Sermon on the Mount. That is what we are fixing our attention upon to-day. That is the basis and reality of religion.

William James said: "Religion is indestructible." What could one want more than that from science? Religion is indestructible. Why is it indestructible? Because there are two sides to our nature. The subliminal side seems to be continually conversing with and handing down great secrets to the conscious side.

More and more religion is seen *not* to depend upon authority; not to depend upon miracles which so largely have been used as an argument for authority.

Religion is not an invention. I learned from the experience I had fifteen years ago when I first came into contact with some socialists who were very radical. They did not make any bones about saying that religion was a fraud, an invention of the priesthood who sat on the left hand of the king, as the army sat on the right hand to defend his power, to magnify his throne. To them religion was a great fraud, a great invention.

Now religion is not an invention, a fraud, or in the ordinary sense, a revelation, but a biological product planted in the nature of man and developed for the purpose of practical benefits.

Historically mankind has been always trying to escape their fears, and religion has perhaps been the chief method by which fears have been overcome and sufficient rest and composure have been given to mankind to do productive work. Imagine a time when our ancestors lived up a tree. They tell us that our insomnia comes from that time and got into the human race because in those times somebody had to sit up all night and see that a big snake didn't crawl up the tree and eat the baby. So that got us in the way of keeping awake, when we are in poor health.

The advantage of Christianity over any religion that I am acquainted with is in the depth of its psychological reading of human nature. That is what we want from religion, from Christianity. Buddhism has been called the religion of resignation, Confucianism the religion of relationships, and Christianity the religion of power—but that definition is more applicable to the Christianity in terms of government than to Christianity as a religion. There is more to life than resignation, and more to it than formal relationships; I see in it the opportunity of developing personality, consciousness, of creating a real thing called the soul.

To-day the laws of this personality are better understood than ever before. The great law is its unification. This means that we do not want to get disorders of our personality that split it up. The next

great law of personality is adaptation to environment, or the creation of an environment that is more suitable for it than the environment it has.

Now really with these two great laws you would have about as much to do as you wanted,—to undertake to have a unified personality, and to undertake to have an environment suitable for it or adapt it to such an environment as it has.

With these two great demands on human life, it would be folly to talk about religion as though it were merely a preparation for death. It is a preparation for life, both in terms of perception that life is a very marvelous experience which deserves our best thought and best powers, and also in terms of those psychic and social laws by which most can be accomplished for the individual and for society.

The object of religion is more even than the formation of character; which was the great thing Phillips Brooks was always preaching; because the object of religion is the production of that out of which character comes, namely, a soul. The object of religion is more than the discussion of ethical theories; it is the production of a substance or being which creates ethical theories as it goes along for its immediate betterment and progress.

The religion of a perfected personality and perfected environment is the religion, as it seems to me, necessary for to-day, and was the religion of Jesus, who showed men to themselves, and showed them the possibilities of organized life which he called "the Kingdom of God." He did this more than it ever

before had been done, and more than has been brought to pass even up to our own time.

Under this conception of religion, that it is a biological product, it becomes a part of all the great knowledge of life—economics, politics, arts, science, etc., instead of fighting these it helps them; instead of denying them it affirms them. And they, instead of denying religion affirm religion. A man with a true understanding of Christ's teaching and the aid, the comfort, the amplification it gives to the religion of perfected personality and perfected environment, is helped by every other side of knowledge and effort. He does not have to be deceived by any kind of fantasy or camouflage. His study is reality. In this attempt to find and live by reality he of course must ask for the greatest freedom of thought and expression and discussion, because he believes that each generation and each individual can make contribution toward the sum of the soul's experience as well as assist to bring about a more perfect world, not at all attainable if matters of belief and practice were stereotyped in any mould of the past.

The authority that religion has is the authority found in the execution of its own laws. It is not something held in the fist of some ecclesiastic or some governmental power. If I remembered a line that I saw years ago in Milton:

"These laws are laws that can enforce themselves." Nobody ought to worry about the laws of the soul, except to obey them—that is all. We don't have to worry about any outside authority.

Jesus is going to be much more honored and followed when He is seen to be the Master in the past of the soul's disclosure to itself, and the Creator of a new society, than when He is treated merely as a mechanical agent in a vicarious process. In short, the position that I have come to hold in regard to Christianity augments and enhances infinitely the spiritual values of the life and teachings of Jesus.

The theologians of the past were helped by various philosophies, and the use of their terminology; the theologian of to-day is being helped by history and science, and the use of their language. There is a book called "The Jesus of History," by T. R. Glover. The first words in this book are:

> "If one thing more than another marks modern thought, it is a new instance on fact."

If you don't remember anything else I have said, remember that. Look at the so-called facts of religion.

I received a letter from a psychiatrist, who says:

> "For the past year I have been working as psychologist with psycho-neurotic ex-soldiers, thus I am in position to see the alarming results of camouflaging, of not being able to face reality."

What we have to do is to face reality, to face facts of consciousness and personality. What we see in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is a picture of the soul under the operation of these laws.

The time allowed me is exceeded, and I will close without further extended reading from my notes.

It is the habit of the Episcopal clergymen, and per-

haps of others, before they preach to say a silent prayer. You see Episcopal clergymen kneel down in silence and presumably say a prayer. When I just assumed that position I asked that we all this morning should be together in this spirit—that we should try to find out something honestly and with our minds given to the undertaking freely, and not reluctantly, not playing with other things in other parts of the world, but with our minds given to this undertaking, of getting hold of something that we as missionaries can go out and tell other people with regard to the religion to-day.

DO WE NEED A NEW RELIGION?

DO WE NEED A NEW RELIGION?

Our subject is, *Do We Need a New Religion?* I am quoting that old text—

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

The Epistle of St. James, the first chapter and the twenty-seventh verse.

Now an interesting thing about the Epistle of St. James—even if Luther did not like it—is that the writer was supposed to be a brother of Jesus. After all, we can think that a brother of Jesus, who became so important in the Church as to write this rather authoritative Epistle, must have known something about Christianity. If he had not anything to do with Christianity or had stood away from Jesus and his followers, then we might say, of course he does not understand and is an enemy, but he was a leader in the Christian Church. It is supposed he wrote a part of the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Acts, and he wrote this Epistle. The brother of Jesus must have known something about Christianity and he had a very practical way of looking at it. It was doing something of a beautiful kind and not surrendering to the ordinary standards of every-day life.

Do we need a new religion? Now the first question

to ask undoubtedly is,—What religion do we already have? Suppose we say that we were brought up in the Christian religion—that is what we are talking about to-day. If so, we may be the followers of any of the two hundred cults into which Christianity in America is divided, with ideas ranging from the Southern Fundamentalists, who based their religion on the miraculous and vicarious atonement; to the Christian Scientists, who also base it on the miraculous, and physical health as derived from religion, or we may take the old-fashioned Unitarian position of James Freeman Clark, in Boston, who when I was a boy used to call Jesus "The Messiah." This Christianity might run anywhere from a Calvinism, which finally declared that man ought to be willing to be damned for the glory of God, to the Christian Socialist who believe Jesus founded a new social order.

But the ordinary every-day idea of the Christian religion is a promise of happiness in the world to come to those who believe that Jesus was their Saviour; and as the Son of God, by his death upon the cross reconciled them to an offended deity, their offense being that they had inherited and continued the sin of their first parent, Adam, according to the story of the Garden of Eden in the Old Testament. I think you will say that is a fair description of ordinary Christianity.

I am willing to admit that such a theory of Christianity seems to me as unworthy of modern intelligence as the religion of Egypt. I used to read what the Egyptian priests believed and what they demanded of the people, and pitied them for such delusions and

thought such delusions a thing of the past. We are just as badly off to-day. I have no doubt that in a few hundred years our priesthood will be thought of in the same way as the average reader of to-day thinks of the Egyptian religion and Priesthood.

We at least have the right to disencumber our minds from these ancient theories of creation and thought of God,—from these myths, as to how man came into the world and where his troubles came from. Henry Fairfield Osborne has written a fine book, "Men of the Old Stone Age." There we see pictures of the Javanese ape-man and the Heidelberg man, etc., and he puts the existence of the Javanese ape-man as five hundred thousand years ago. Yes, some writers put him a million years ago. Here is H. G. Wells, that writes the story of the earth and its history, and yesterday I saw a one-volume edition with pictures which was very much easier to read and very much more graphic than the two big volumes first published. Then here is Mr. Van Loon with his "Story of Mankind." I sat next to him at dinner the other day and he told me that he had sold seventy thousand volumes at five dollars apiece. He is a Harvard man, six feet two, a big man with a wide nature and a wide view of things.

With all that stirring knowledge in our mind are we going to hold to the things taught in Sunday School, that the earth is six or seven thousand years old, that Adam was the first man, a very superior person, who succumbed to a woman's influence. It goes without saying that we have got to disencumber our minds of

a great deal of the material that lies at the basis of ordinary theology to-day.

In my house in the country I had an attic where we stowed broken furniture, empty trunks and general odds and ends. It was only four or five feet high, so that every time any one went to it they had to double up like a jackknife to get about and were pretty sure to bump their heads. On one occasion a part of this attic which had not been boarded over was invaded by a stupid workman, who ran his legs down through the lathe and plaster so that they dangled in a shocking and threatening manner in one of the bedchambers in the house. Who can say that it wasn't a wise move to raise the roof six or eight feet and make a clean story with sleeping rooms and bath rooms, in place of this head-bumping attic and wasted area. I am just suggesting it in relation with the mental attics of our minds. Instead of mental attics full of ideas that need repair let us make more good and usuable rooms in the upper regions of our thought.

Critics tell me to be positive. They say, why anybody can be negative. Somebody sent me a little skit from a newspaper out west which said that Brother So-and-so got up in the pulpit last Sunday morning after Sister Trask has sung a solo and said, "I don't believe in God," and many ridiculous and unusual things he did not believe in. And the paper made some amusing comments on the result of this. Just bear me witness I am not that kind of a person. I do not try to say shocking things. I do not try to say negative things. But the best thing a doctor can do

for a patient sometimes is to get a lot of poisons out of his system. Suppose a woman about five feet three inches in height and weighing two hundred and twenty-five pounds went to Carlsbad, to a doctor and said, "I want to be healthier than I am at present." The doctor said, "Madam, the first thing to do is to get rid of fifty or seventy-five or perhaps a hundred pounds of your weight. You must give up candy and cake, and ice cream soda and desserts, and white bread and potatoes." And she replies, "Doctor, I don't like such a negative person as you. I want an affirmative kind of a person. I like a constructive man, a person who builds up and tells you what you can do and not what you cannot do." Would not the doctor say, "My dear madam, do you realize you ought to get rid of useless flesh in order to have the organs work healthfully. The positive thing I am doing for you is to give more life to your liver, kidneys, stomach, upon which your existence depends?"

If religiously we are occupied in getting rid of some of this strangulating superstition, if we can say that this big bulk of belief fastened to us is reduced so that our conscience and reason can healthfully work again and not be smothered by false ideas that enclose us like the good-for-nothing flesh on that woman—*are we not doing a positive thing?*

One trouble with the Christian religion is that its miraculousness was supposed to be vouched for by the Old Testament. Yes, that threw Christianity back into the Old Testament and made a great deal of the

Old Testament. The Old Testament was given consequently an authority almost equal to the New Testament. When I went to Sunday School nobody told me that the Old Testament was an entirely different thing from the New. I took them as one book, one God, one Gospel, one idea. Many crude conceptions of God have been brought into Christian teaching by this doorway—the Old Testament. The God of Vengeance, the Lord of Hosts, the War God, the Thunder God, the God that destroyed by floods, by fire, those whom He regarded as disobedient. All of this has helped this common, every-day conception of Christianity, which at heart is not Christianity at all, but a combination of the Hebrew Sacrificial system with the Pagan Sacrificial system, found in Italy after the Christian Era. If this is our religion I should say we needed a new one.

But the new Christian religion is really the oldest form of Christianity in my opinion, as declared by Jesus himself—one of love and personal service. When he asked his disciples to follow him, it was to *do* something. He did not exact some test. He was glad enough to get them to follow him without putting up difficult questions to them. He said, "Follow me." He sent them out to preach and to minister, to heal the sick and to cheer the humble and miserable by news of a better social order which he called the "Kingdom of God." Jesus said, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you"; but I do not understand that he meant that was the only place it was. How convenient it is for a man with thirty or forty or fifty

thousand dollars a year, who don't want to be touched with the social side of things to say, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." I do not understand Jesus meant we have no need of outward organization. I understand that any commonsense and kind person has instincts within himself, especially under the inspiration and companionship of Jesus, for a juster arrangement of life, for a squarer deal and a less cruel system by which men eat their daily bread, but he must bring it to pass.

A friend of mine wrote me from a Pennsylvania town last week, a successful business man in his town, saying that there were seven churches there and only one bathtub. Does that represent a desirable religion? What is the matter with the religion that will multiply churches by seven and have only one bath tub? Especially in the light of a court decision recently in a divorce case to which Heywood Broun called attention, where the divorce was granted by the judge to the wife whose only complaint against her husband was that he "would not wash." There are some people who don't want any kind of divorce but I think the judges are going to say to a particular kind of husband—wash, make yourself clean. Wash! A religion is unpractical that says it need not put any bath tubs—or only one—in a town where there are several thousand inhabitants. The Church cannot forbid divorce, then encourage dirty husbands; judges won't stand it.

The religion that people want, so far as I can see, is one that makes them healthy; that makes them

cheerful; that makes them see the best in life and want to expand the number of years they are to exist here on earth; that makes them want to take a hand in removing the burdens from other people's shoulders, which they do not say all the time are due to the result of the sins of these other people. That used to be a popular way of getting rid of responsibility by saying that these burdens of other people were due to their own sins, and if they couldn't see any overt sin there must be some secret sin; that person had offended God and was being punished and that we must not interfere with the punishments of God. That is we must not interfere with the brother God was trying to punish, that would be to fly in the face of God's Providence. None of us believe that any more. In fact we are taking a very different idea of sin now from the idea we used to have.

I was brought up to think a "fallen woman" was a terrible person. Well, I was asked to be a trustee of one of these places which takes care of girls who get into trouble, and they used to come and sit here in the gallery. When I looked in their faces I said, "Something is the matter with those girls, they are not just normal girls, something is the matter with them." Then I read books by great students of the question which said that fifty to eighty per cent. of such inmates of the public institutions were defective. Then I met a doctor of psychiatry in Sing Sing and he said that twenty-five to forty per cent. of the inmates there were defective; that twelve per cent. were insane —seventy-five per cent. might just as well be in the

hospital. Under those circumstances we have got to revolutionize our ideas of personal responsibility and put a lot of responsibility upon the parents, upon schools, upon the other institutions under which we live to-day,—business methods, etc., so that there shall not be so many defective and insane people, so many morally sick. It is time for religion to change its ways. Even the things called good and bad are being revised and different lists are being made up.

A number of years ago who thought of going to a movie on Sunday or a play? Well, now we see all these people who live in tenement houses, or all these people who have a day of rest who used to sleep all day Sunday or sit around aimlessly now want something that quickens their imaginations, something that takes them on the wings of eagles and carries them all over the world. They want to be moved by the passions of life. Is anybody going to deny that Sunday is a perfectly proper time for people to indulge in larger mental and emotional recreations. To-day we are going through a revision of everything.

A lot of Christian ministers used to think their faces must look as sharp as a meat axe, or as puckered as if they had swallowed a lemon, in order to give evidence that they were the servants of God. Such an idea of religion is hypocritical nonsense. The religion that to-day is wanted is one of smiles and health. You can depend upon it the young people of to-day are not going to waste their time and tangle their brains believing a lot of things that their grandparents supposed they believed. If our friends or descendants are hon-

est bankers and just and righteous manufacturers, and incorruptible public officials, they are going to acquire a character that makes them honest and square and incorruptible from a high ideal of the possibilities of human nature, from pride in doing the best sort of thing that their inheritance and their opportunities and their acquired traits permit them to do; and from a determination to best all the lower forms of life that attack them, and all the vicissitudes that would overcome them, and be an incarnate god of human triumphs.

We talk about the incarnation as though it were a peculiar doctrine of Christianity, an experience that Jesus alone had. But every birth is an incarnation and every life an opportunity to perfect the range of superlative powers within the personality of a human being,—that is the very meaning and object and zest of life—the incarnation of all the powers of heaven and earth to produce more perfect human beings.

This attitude toward religion is nothing new but it does away with a lot of old time clutter, a lot of old time confusion to the mind and burdens to the conscience, it concentrates on the simpler aspects of Christianity.

When Jesus said, "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest," and "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me for my yoke is easy and my burden light," he certainly did not mean that his hearers were any longer to be slaves of Old Testament theology, or in the future of Platonic

or Aristotlean philosophy; or St. Thomas Aquinas or Calvinism. Those are burdens worse than Jesus' hearers had. But Jesus told them there was one thing they should do—"Thou shalt love, the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Think of the simplicity of Christianity and then what we have made of it.

There are some clergymen, and very advanced thinkers too, who seem to think it does not make any difference whether you are a fundamentalist and base your faith on miracles, or are a modernist and give science a place in religion—if you serve the Lord. But my contention is that the Lord is not the same Lord to each of those different beliefs. To the fundamentalist Jesus is an old fashioned God, to the modernist he is a new fashioned man. As a God he is of very little use as an example. As a man he is the illumination of human destiny.

Now there has always been personal religion in the world, the religion of your souls as distinct from the religion of national or ecclesiastical ritual. When we pray or when we read what we regard as holy writings or think deeply about life, we are indulging in personal religion. Yes, and when you help your fellow man. Of course we all have a personal religion, but the point is do you want a deeper personal religion, do you want one that does not have adhesions that ought to be cut? Do you want a profounder conception of what is possible to you in the mystery of life and revelation before the illimitable

universe with its years running back equal to its space distances and its mystery?

My contention is that we have the possibility to-day of having a profounder personal religion than ever there has been in the world before because there is more that is appealing to us, more that has a tremendous energizing and motor force in our lives, as we learn of our hidden powers.

The warden of the prison down at Blackwell's Island tells that he took Coué through the institution and some of the women in the hospital went on the stage to see if Coué could help them. Now wardens are persons who ordinarily are not imaginative or sentimental people. They keep their eyes open, are not easily deceived in what they see. This warden told me that after a little experimenting one of the paralytic and two or three of the lame women were running up and down the platform with Coué like Isadora Duncan's pupils.

This is one direction in which the powers of the mind are being revealed to us—just one direction. And there are many other directions. Are we to say they have nothing to do with our religion, our religious ideas, or our religious hopes or practices, or our relations to each other.

Man in my opinion is a different thing if he is a degenerate son of Adam from what he is if considered as a highly developed descendant of the Javanese ape-man. I would much rather be a bright son of a peasant than the degenerate son of a duke. I would much rather be on the upgrade from an ape than

on the downgrade from Adam. And it makes a great deal of difference to our religion which ideas we have, whether we think we are all laboring for higher and higher human evolution or whether we are rolling in the dust and complaining of Adam.

Suppose we say that the story of the Garden of Eden is just another way of accounting for sin. But to-day, as I have already said, much that was called sin must be attributed to something entirely different.

Monsieur Hilare Belloc, who came over here from England, belongs I believe, to the Roman Catholic Church. He says he takes his religion on authority, just as he takes the latitude and longitude of New York. That is a deceptive saying. A man as intelligent as Belloc has no business to say it. Every one knows that scientific authority and ecclesiastical authority are absolutely different things. Scientific authority can be checked up by any one who will take the trouble; nobody can check up ecclesiastic authority. If you have studied mathematics you might find for yourself the latitude and longitude of New York, but you might study your head off and you could not prove the infallibility of the Pope, or a lot of the things regarded as essential by some people to Christian belief. Don't ever be fooled by things like that, by people who try to mix you up by making out that all things are more or less covered by one kind of authority.

We cannot adhere to fables and hold the same spiritual conceptions that more enlightened and liberal-minded people hold. That is the point. My conten-

tion is that mind, mind, mind, contributes something to religion, even to personal religion, even to spirituality.

Truth is not an insult to Jesus. Fancy anybody thinking a search for truth is an insult to Jesus—then every laboratory in the world is an insult to Jesus, every historical statistician, every social worker, trying to understand how the ills of industrious life can be cured. Truth is not an insult to Jesus, but without being personal I think I could say, and I think you would agree with me, that left-over paganism, unquestioned falsehood, mental laziness, a love of millinery and incense and bowings and scrapings in the name of Jesus are an insult to a religious teacher who discarded all forms and said God is spirit.

Now, Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts, is practically at the head of the Episcopal Church in America—he has not the title, but if there is any hard job to do he is called upon to do it. He raised four millions of dollars for Harvard College and two or three millions for Wellesley College, and eight or ten millions for the Protestant Episcopal Church Pension Fund. Now he is raising a million for the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge. I don't know a better Theological school; it is better now than when I went there because it has made an arrangement with Harvard College by which all the students can study anything they please in Harvard, particularly Sociology and Economics. So that when Bishop Lawrence wants a million dollars for this school he has a right to have it and I hope he will get it. As he generally gets more money than he asks for he will doubtless get it

and he deserves it. He is a cousin of the President of Harvard College, and is about the whole thing in Massachusetts. Let me read you what he says in the last number of *The Outlook*. His problem is about clergymen. One problem is why don't a finer type of young man come to the Theological School. That is one of his questions. My answer to that is because when they get into the church they are not given the opportunity to use their education and brains —the brains that brought them into the Theological School.

Bishop Lawrence says he asked a young friend to find out what men and women on the street think of ministers. Because naturally the young men asked to come into the ministry are more or less impressed by what persons they associate with are saying about ministers.

"The ministers are clever at sliding through; they don't believe what they say," says a tradesman's wife. "They keep telling you what you mustn't do; that you can't do this and that—play cards, go to the theatre. They talk about charity and won't give a man a cent or a job. I had enough of them when I was a girl."

"Ministers aren't interesting," adds an automobile man. "Everything they tell me I know already. The minister never comes into my shop to see me; and I am glad of it."

"Ministers are fakers," answers a Syrian shoemaker, a member of a Congregational church. "They look after Americans and think the rest of us are duds."

A manager of machine works does not hesitate: "Ninety-nine per cent. of the ministers are wishy-wasy. They are preaching for money."

And so on. Perhaps Bishop Lawrence concluded that young ministers were going to have a harder time than

he thought, and that he must make it easier for young ministers.

This is important. I knew one of the finest young men ever brought up for ordination, of great promise intellectually, a fine personality, a spiritual young man, but after three years of study in the Cambridge School they would not ordain him because he had some misgivings about the creed. Evidently those days are past in Massachusetts. This is what Bishop Lawrence says:

"To-day men are impatient of creeds, Why? Because they see in creeds barriers before the Church to keep out those whose minds ecclesiastical authority or tradition cannot dominate. And in this they see creeds as history reveals them."

So says the Bishop of Massachusetts, in my opinion the leader of the American Church, who has done more for it than anybody else, the man with the greatest social and ecclesiastical prestige of any man in the church.

"The articles of the great historic creeds of the Churches were devised and adopted, not to enlarge faith, but to narrow belief; not to make faith inviting, but to make orthodoxy exclusive; not to liberate the minds of men, but to bring them under control."

I must omit some excellent statements.

"If then, the Church is to retain leadership, it must learn to think less of its authority and more of the 'Liberty of the Gospel.' It must think less of creed and more of faith. It must depend less on what it may demand of men and more on what it has to offer them."

That is a good but new way of looking at theologs.

"Is there, then, no place for a creed? Certainly; but it is not the place that it was built to occupy. In the church of the

future it will stand not at the entrance blocking the way, but at the center, a symbol and monument or, as the Rev. Roland Cotton Smith expresses it in his article on another page of this issue, 'A Blazing Signal on the Mountain Top.'

"Is there, then, to be no test for entrance into the church? Surely; but not the test of a creed, but of the will and the life. In the church of the future the test will not be that which the church has devised, but only that which the Master of the church required—the willingness, the determination, to come and follow him."

Yet think of what the clergy have to ask of the sponsors at baptism. They ask if they believe all the articles of the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed. That is what the Prayer Book says. Evidently a man like Bishop Lawrence, of great authority, great experience and understanding of young men and modern life, is at last convinced that there is a great wave of intelligence and honesty sweeping down through the church to-day. I ask you to help that along, I ask you to write to *The Outlook* and commend what Bishop Lawrence said in their issue of February 21st; or write Bishop Lawrence and say, "Why do you not take the leadership of this great movement for putting mind and putting Twentieth Century knowledge to the service of Jesus Christ." Why cannot we help this very church here to carry along these truths. I do not ask you to be baptized, but I ask you to come into a fellowship that means interest, that means earnest desire to help, that means a perception of the way the thing is going here and the great possibilities of a church. Why don't you, in view of all those things, take hold and do what you can in the spirit of Jesus Christ? Send in your name to us. Let us know who

you are. Offer your services to some organization, at any rate tell me if you care for what you hear to-day, and if you will push this ball of liberalism along.

Do we need to have a new religion? Yes, if the old religion will not make room for the modern mind; if it will not clean house and get rid of old fetishes inherited from centuries ago.

Do we need a new religion? No, if the life of Jesus becomes the light of his Church, a liberating, forgiving, brotherly, serving religion, that breaks down barriers and makes of all mankind one self-respecting and humanity-revering nation and force.

10066

The Evangelical
School of Theology

DATE DUE

BX 5132 .G419 1923

Grant, Percy Stickney, 1860-

The religion of Main street

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX5132.G419 1923
Grant, Percy The religion of Main stree
3 0645 0004 0892 8